arXiv:1603.05222v1 [math.PR] 16 Mar 2016

Scaling transition for nonlinear random fields with long-range dependence

Vytautė Pilipauskaitė[1,2] and Donatas Surgailis[1]

[1] Vilnius University, Akademijos 4, LT-08663 Vilnius, Lithuania

[2] Université de Nantes, 1, quai de Tourville BP, Nantes 44313, France

March 17, 2016

Abstract. We obtain a complete description of anisotropic scaling limits and the existence of scaling transition for nonlinear functions (Appell polynomials) of stationary linear random fields on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ with moving average coefficients decaying at possibly different rate in the horizontal and vertical direction. The paper extends recent results on scaling transition for linear random fields in [30], [31].

Keywords: scaling transition; anisotropic long-range dependence; fractionally integrated random field; Appell polynomials; multiple Itô-Wiener integral; fractional Brownian sheet

1 Introduction

[30] introduced the notion of scaling transition for stationary random field (RF) $X = \{X(t,s); (t,s) \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}$ on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ in terms of partial sums limits

$$D_{\lambda,\gamma}^{-1} \sum_{(t,s)\in K_{[\lambda x, \lambda^\gamma y]}} X(t,s) \stackrel{\text{fdd}}{\longrightarrow} V_\gamma(x,y), \quad (x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2_+, \quad \lambda \to \infty, \quad \gamma > 0 \tag{1.1}$$

where $D_{\lambda,\gamma} \to \infty$ is normalization and $K_{[\lambda x, \lambda^\gamma y]} := \{(t,s) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : 1 \le t \le \lambda x, 1 \le s \le \lambda^\gamma y\}$ is a family of rectangles whose sides grow at possibly different rate $O(\lambda)$ and $O(\lambda^\gamma)$ and $\gamma > 0$ is *arbitrary*. See the end of this section for all unexplained notation. RF X is said to exhibit *scaling transition* at $\gamma_0 > 0$ if the limit RFs $V_\gamma \equiv V_\gamma^X$ in (1.1) do not depend on γ for $\gamma > \gamma_0$ and $\gamma < \gamma_0$ and are different up to a multiplicative constant, viz.,

$$V_\gamma^X \stackrel{\text{fdd}}{=} V_+^X \ (\forall \gamma > \gamma_0), \qquad V_\gamma^X \stackrel{\text{fdd}}{=} V_-^X \ (\forall \gamma < \gamma_0), \qquad V_+^X \stackrel{\text{fdd}}{\neq} aV_-^X \ (\forall a > 0). \tag{1.2}$$

In such case, RF $V_{\gamma_0}^X$ is called the *well-balanced* while RFs V_+^X and V_-^X the *unbalanced* scaling limits of X.

It appears that scaling transition is a new and general feature of spatial dependence which occurs for many isotropic and anisotropic RF on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ with long-range dependence (LRD). It was established for a class of

aggregated α-stable autoregressive models [30], a class of Gaussian LRD RFs [31], and some RFs arising by aggregation of network traffic and random-coefficient time series models in telecommunications and economics; see [11], [22], [26], [27], also ([30], Remark 2.3). The unbalanced limits $V_{\pm}$ in the these studies have a very special dependence structure (either independent or invariant rectangular increments along one of the coordinate axes) and coincide in the Gaussian case with a fractional Brownian sheet (FBS) B_{H_1,H_2} with one of the two parameters $H_1, H_2 \in (0,1]$ equal to $1/2$ or 1.

The above mentioned works deal with linear RF models written as sums (stochastic integrals) w.r.t. i.i.d. 'noise'. It is well-known that nonlinear RFs can display quite complicated nongaussian scaling behavior. See Dobrushin and Major [9], also [1], [2], [13], [14], [16], [19], [21], [33], [34] and the references therein.

The present paper establishes the existence of scaling transition for a class of nonlinear subordinated RFs:

$$X(t,s) = G(Y(t,s)), \tag{1.3}$$

where $Y = \{Y(t,s), (t,s) \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}$ is a stationary linear LRD RF in (1.4) and $G(x) = A_k(x), x \in \mathbb{R}$ is the Appell polynomial of degree $k \geq 1$ (see Sec. 2 for the definition) with $\mathrm{E}G^2(Y(0,0)) < \infty$, $\mathrm{E}G(Y(t,s)) = 0$. The (underlying) RF Y is written as a moving-average

$$Y(t,s) \;=\; \sum_{(u,v)\in\mathbb{Z}^2} a(t-u, s-v)\varepsilon(u,v), \qquad (t,s) \in \mathbb{Z}^2, \tag{1.4}$$

in a standardized i.i.d. sequence $\{\varepsilon(u,v); (u,v) \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}$ with deterministic moving-average coefficients such that

$$a(t,s) \;\sim\; \mathrm{const}\,(|t|^2 + |s|^{2q_2/q_1})^{-q_1/2}, \qquad |t| + |s| \to \infty, \tag{1.5}$$

where parameters $q_1, q_2 > 0$ satisfy

$$1 < Q := \frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2} < 2. \tag{1.6}$$

In Theorems 3.1-3.5 below, the moving-average coefficients $a(t,s)$ may take a more general form in (2.1) including an 'angular function'. Condition $Q < 2$ guarantees that $\sum_{(t,s)\in\mathbb{Z}} a(t,s)^2 < \infty$ or Y in (1.4) is well-defined, while $Q > 1$ implies that $\sum_{(t,s)\in\mathbb{Z}} |a(t,s)| = \infty$ (in other words, that RF Y is LRD). Note $a(t,0) = O(|t|^{-q_1})$, $a(0,s) = O(|s|^{-q_2})$ decay at a different rate when $q_1 \neq q_2$ in which case Y exhibits strong anisotropy. The form of moving-average coefficients in (1.5) implies a similar behavior of the covariance function $r_Y(t,s) := \mathrm{E}Y(0,0)Y(t,s) = \sum_{(u,v)\in\mathbb{Z}^2} a(u,v)a(t+u,s+v)$, namely

$$r_Y(t,s) \;\sim\; \mathrm{const}\,(|t|^2 + |s|^{2p_2/p_1})^{-p_1/2}, \qquad |t| + |s| \to \infty, \tag{1.7}$$

where

$$p_i := q_i(2-Q), \qquad i = 1,2. \tag{1.8}$$

Note $p_1/p_2 = q_1/q_2$ and the 1-1 correspondence between (q_1, q_2) and (p_1, p_2):

$$q_i := \frac{p_i}{2}(1+P), \qquad i = 1,2, \quad \text{where} \quad P := \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}. \tag{1.9}$$

(1.7) implies that for any integer $k \geq 1$ and $P \notin \mathbb{N}$

$$\sum_{(t,s)\in\mathbb{Z}^2} |r_Y(t,s)|^k = \infty \qquad \Longleftrightarrow \qquad 1 \leq k < P, \tag{1.10}$$

see Proposition 5.1. In the case when Y in (1.4) is Gaussian RF, $r_Y^k(t,s)$ coincides with the covariance of the kth Hermite polynomial $H_k(Y(t,s))$ of Y and the (nonlinear) subordinated RF $X = H_k(Y)$ is LRD if condition (1.10) holds. A similar result is true for nongaussian moving-average RF Y in (1.4) and Hermite polynomial H_k replaced by Appell polynomial A_k.

The following summary describes the main results of this paper.

(R1) Subordinated RFs $X = A_k(Y), 1 \leq k < P$ exhibit scaling transition at the same point $\gamma_0 := p_1/p_2 = q_1/q_2$ independent of k.

(R2) The well-balanced scaling limit $V_{\gamma_0}^X$ of $X = A_k(Y)$ is non-gaussian unless $k = 1$ and is given by a k-tuple Itô-Wiener integral.

(R3) Unbalanced scaling limits $V_+^X = V_\gamma^X, \gamma > \gamma_0$ of $X = A_k(Y)$ agree with FBS $B_{H_{1k}^+,1/2}$ with Hurst parameter $H_{1k}^+ \in (1/2, 1)$ if $kp_2 > 1$, and with a 'generalized Hermite slide' $V_+^X(x,y) = xZ_k^+(y)$ if $kp_2 < 1$, where Z_k^+ is a self-similar process written as a k-tuple Itô-Wiener integral. A similar fact holds for unbalanced limits $V_-^X = V_\gamma^X, \gamma < \gamma_0$.

(R4) For $k > P$, RF $X = A_k(Y)$ does not exhibit scaling transition and all scaling limits $V_\gamma^X, \gamma > 0$ agree with Brownian sheet $B_{1/2,1/2}$.

(R5) In the case of Gaussian underlying RF Y in (1.4), the above conclusions hold for general nonlinear function G in (1.3) and k equal to the Hermite rank of G.

The above list contains several new noncentral and central limit results. (R2), (R4) and (R5) are new in the 'anisotropic' case $p_1 \neq p_2$ while (R3) is new even for linear RF $X = A_1(Y) = Y$ (see Remark 3.1 concerning the terminology in (R3)). Similarly as in the case of linear models (see [30], [31]), unbalanced limits in (R3) have either independent or completely dependent increments along one of the coordinate axes. According to (R3), the sample mean of nonlinear LRD RF $X = A_k(Y), 1 < k < P$ on rectangles $K_{[\lambda,\lambda^\gamma]}, \gamma \neq \gamma_0$ may have gaussian or nongaussian limit distribution depending on k, γ and parameters p_1, p_2, moreover, in both cases the variance of the sum $\sum_{(t,s)\in K_{[\lambda,\lambda^\gamma]}} X(t,s)$ grows faster than $\lambda^{1+\gamma}$, or the number of summands. The dichotomy of the limit distribution in (R3) is related to the presence or absence of the vertical/horizontal LRD property of X, see Remark 6.1. We also note that our proofs of the central limit results in (R3) and (R4) use rather simple approximation by m-dependent r.v.'s and do not require a combinatorial argument or Malliavin's calculus as in [6], [24] and other papers.

The paper is organized as follows. Sec. 2 provides the precise assumptions on RFs Y and X and some known properties of Appell polynomials. Sec. 3 contains formulations of the main results (Theorems 3.1-3.5)

as described in (R1)-(R5) above. Sec. 4 provides two examples of linear fractionally integrated RFs satisfying the assumptions in Sec. 2. Sec. 5 discusses some properties of generalized homogeneous functions and their convolutions used to prove the results. Sec. 6 discusses the asymptotic form of the covariance function and the asymptotics of the variance of anisotropic partial sums of subordinated RF $X = A_k(Y)$. All proofs are collected in Sec. 7 and 8.

Notation. In this paper, $\stackrel{\mathrm{d}}{\longrightarrow}$, $\stackrel{\mathrm{fdd}}{\longrightarrow}$, $\stackrel{\mathrm{d}}{=}$, $\stackrel{\mathrm{fdd}}{=}$ denote the weak convergence and equality of (finite dimensional) distributions. C stands for a generic positive constant which may assume different values at various locations and whose precise value has no importance. $\mathbb{R}_+ := (0,\infty)$, $\mathbb{R}_+^2 := (0,\infty)^2$, $\mathbb{R}_0^2 := \mathbb{R}^2\backslash\{(0,0)\}$, $\mathbb{Z}_+ := \{0,1,\cdots\}$, $\mathbb{N}_+ := \{1,2,\cdots\}$, $\mathbb{Z}^{\bullet 2k} := \{((u_1,v_1),\cdots,(u_k,v_k)) \in \mathbb{Z}^{2k} : (u_i,v_i) \neq (u_j,v_j), 1 \leq i < j \leq k\}, k \in \mathbb{N}_+$, $|t|_+ := |t| \vee 1\, (t \in \mathbb{Z})$.

2 Assumptions and preliminaries

Assumption (A1) $\{\varepsilon, \varepsilon(t,s), (t,s) \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}$ is an i.i.d. sequence with $\mathrm{E}\varepsilon = 0, \mathrm{E}\varepsilon^2 = 1$

Assumption (A2) $Y = \{Y(t,s), (t,s) \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}$ is a moving-average RF in (1.4) with coefficients

$$a(t,s) \;=\; \frac{1}{(|t|^2+|s|^{2q_2/q_1})^{q_1/2}}\Big(L_0\big(\frac{t}{(|t|^2+|s|^{2q_2/q_1})^{1/2}}\big)+o(1)\Big), \qquad |t|+|s| \to \infty, \tag{2.1}$$

where $q_i > 0, i = 1,2$ satisfy $Q = \sum_{i=1}^2 q_i^{-1} \in (1,2)$ (see (1.6)) and $L_0(u) \geq 0, u \in [-1,1]$ is a bounded piece-wise continuous function on $[-1,1]$.

We refer to L_0 in (2.1) as the *angular function*. Particularly, for $q_1 = q_2$, $\rho = (|t|^2+|s|^2)^{1/2}$ and $\arccos(t/\rho)$ are the polar coordinates of $(t,s) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Assumptions (A1)-(A2) imply $\mathrm{E}Y(0,0)^2 = \sum_{(t,s)\in\mathbb{Z}^2} a(t,s)^2 < \infty$ and hence RF Y in (1.4) is well-defined and stationary, with zero mean $\mathrm{E}Y(t,s) = 0$. Moreover, if $\mathrm{E}|\varepsilon|^\alpha < \infty$ for some $\alpha > 2$ then $\mathrm{E}|Y(t,s)|^\alpha < \infty$ follows by Rosenthal's inequality; see e.g. ([14], Corollary 2.5.1).

Given a r.v. ξ with $\mathrm{E}|\xi|^k < \infty, k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, the kth Appell polynomial $A_k(x)$ relative to the distribution of ξ is defined by $A_k(x) := (-\mathrm{i})^k \mathrm{d}^k(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}ux}/\mathrm{E}\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}u\xi})/\mathrm{d}u^k\big|_{u=0}$. See [2], [14] for various properties of Appell polynomials. In as follows, $A_k(\xi)$ stands for the r.v. obtained by substituting $x = \xi$ in the Appell polynomial $A_k(x)$ relative to the distribution of ξ. Particularly, if $\mathrm{E}\xi = 0$ then $A_1(\xi) = \xi$, $A_2(\xi) = \xi^2 - \mathrm{E}\xi^2$, $A_3(\xi) = \xi^3 - 3\xi\mathrm{E}\xi^2 - \mathrm{E}\xi^3$ etc. For standard normal $\xi \sim N(0,1)$ the Appell polynomials $A_k(\xi) = H_k(\xi) = (-\mathrm{i})^k \mathrm{d}^k \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}u\xi+u^2/2}/\mathrm{d}u^k\big|_{u=0}$ agree with the Hermite polynomials.

Assumption (A3)$_k$ For $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$, $\mathrm{E}|\varepsilon|^{2k} < \infty$ and

$$X = \{X(t,s) := A_k(Y(t,s)), (t,s) \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}, \tag{2.2}$$

where A_k is the kth Appell polynomial relative to the (marginal) distribution of $Y(t,s)$ in (1.4).

We also use the representation of (2.2) via *Wick products* of noise variables (see [14], Ch. 14):

$$A_k(Y(t,s)) \;=\; \sum_{(u,v)_k \in \mathbb{Z}^{2k}} a(t-u_1,s-v_1)\cdots a(t-u_k,s-v_k)\,{:}\varepsilon(u_1,v_1)\cdots\varepsilon(u_k,v_k){:}\,. \tag{2.3}$$

By definition, for *mutually distinct* points $(u_j, v_j) \neq (u_{j'}, v_{j'})$ $(j \neq j', 1 \leq j, j' \leq i)$ the Wick product $:\varepsilon(u_1, v_1)^{k_1} \cdots \varepsilon(u_i, v_i)^{k_i}: = \prod_{j=1}^{i} A_{k_j}(\varepsilon(u_j, v_j))$ equals the product of *independent* r.v.'s $A_{k_j}(\varepsilon(u_j, v_j)), 1 \leq j \leq i$. (2.3) leads to the decomposition of (2.2) into the 'off-diagonal' and 'diagonal' parts:

$$A_k(Y(t,s)) = Y^{\bullet k}(t,s) + \mathcal{Z}(t,s), \tag{2.4}$$

where

$$Y^{\bullet k}(t,s) \ := \ \sum_{(u,v)_k}^{\bullet} a(t-u_1, s-v_1) \cdots a(t-u_k, s-v_k)\varepsilon(u_1, v_1) \cdots \varepsilon(u_k, v_k) \tag{2.5}$$

and the sum $\sum_{(u,v)_k}^{\bullet}$ is taken over all $(u,v)_k = ((u_1, v_1), \cdots, (u_k, v_k)) \in \mathbb{Z}^{2k}$ such that $(u_i, v_i) \neq (u_j, v_j)$ $(i \neq j)$ (the set of such $(u,v)_k \in \mathbb{Z}^{2k}$ will be denoted by $\mathbb{Z}^{\bullet 2k}$). By definition, the 'diagonal' part $\mathcal{Z}(t,s)$ in (2.4) is given by the r.h.s. of (2.3) with $(u,v)_k \in \mathbb{Z}^{2k}$ replaced by $(u,v)_k \in \mathbb{Z}^{2k} \setminus \mathbb{Z}^{\bullet 2k}$. In most of our limit results, $\mathcal{Z}(t,s)$ is negligible and $Y^{\bullet k}(t,s)$ is the main term which is easier to handle compared to $A_k(Y(t,s))$ in (2.4). We also note that limit distributions of partial sums of 'off-diagonal' polynomial forms in i.i.d. r.v.'s were studied in [33], [14], [3] and other works.

Assumption (A4)$_k$ $\varepsilon(0,0) \stackrel{\mathrm{d}}{=} Z$ and $Y(0,0) \stackrel{\mathrm{d}}{=} Z$ have standard normal distribution $Z \sim N(0,1)$ and $X(t,s) = G(Y(t,s))$, where $G = G(x), x \in \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable function with $\mathrm{E}G(Z)^2 < \infty, \mathrm{E}G(Z) = 0$ and Hermite rank $k \geq 1$.

Assumptions (A1), (A2) and (A4)$_k$ imply that Y in (1.4) is a Gaussian RF. As noted above, under Assumption (A4)$_k$ Appell polynomials $A_k(x)$ coincide with Hermite polynomials $H_k(x)$. Recall that the Hermite rank of a measurable function $G : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\mathrm{E}G(Z)^2 < \infty$ is defined as the index k of the lowest nonzero coefficient c_j in the Hermite expansion of G, viz., $G(x) = \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} c_j H_j(x)/j!$ where $c_k \neq 0$.

Let $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2k})$ denote the Hilbert space of real-valued functions $h = h((u,v)_k), (u,v)_k = (u_1, v_1, \cdots, u_k, v_k) \in \mathbb{R}^{2k}$ with finite norm $\|h\|_k := \{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2k}} h^2((u,v)_k)\mathrm{d}(u,v)_k\}^{1/2}$, $\mathrm{d}(u,v)_k = \mathrm{d}u_1\mathrm{d}v_1 \cdots \mathrm{d}u_k\mathrm{d}v_k$. Let $W = \{W(\mathrm{d}u, \mathrm{d}v), (u,v) \in \mathbb{R}^2\}$ denote a real-valued Gaussian white noise with zero mean and variance $\mathrm{E}W(\mathrm{d}u, \mathrm{d}v)^2 = \mathrm{d}u\mathrm{d}v$. For any $h \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2k})$ the k-tuple Itô-Wiener integral $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2k}} h((u,v)_k)\mathrm{d}^k W = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2k}} h(u_1, v_1, \cdots, u_k, v_k)W(\mathrm{d}u_1, \mathrm{d}v_1) \cdots W(\mathrm{d}u_k, \mathrm{d}v_k)$ is well-defined and satisfies $\mathrm{E}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2k}} h((u,v)_k)\mathrm{d}^k W = 0$, $\mathrm{E}\big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2k}} h((u,v)_k)\mathrm{d}^k W\big)^2 \leq k!\|h\|_k^2$; see e.g. [14].

3 Main results

Recall the definitions p_i, P in (1.8), (1.9); $\gamma_0 = q_1/q_2 = p_1/p_2$. Denote

$$S^X_{\lambda,\gamma}(x,y) := \sum_{(t,s) \in K_{[\lambda x, \lambda^{\gamma} y]}} X(t,s), \qquad S^X_{\lambda,\gamma} := S^X_{\lambda,\gamma}(1,1). \tag{3.1}$$

Consider a RF

$$V_{k,\gamma_0}(x,y) \ := \ \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2k}} h(x,y;(u,v)_k)\mathrm{d}^k W, \quad (x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2_+, \tag{3.2}$$

where (c.f. (2.1))

$$h(x,y;(u,v)_k) := \int_{(0,x]\times(0,y]} \prod_{\ell=1}^{k} a_\infty(t-u_\ell, s-v_\ell)\mathrm{d}t\mathrm{d}s, \quad \text{where} \tag{3.3}$$
$$a_\infty(t,s) := (|t|^2+|s|^{2q_2/q_1})^{-q_1/2} L_0\big(t/(|t|^2+|s|^{2q_2/q_1})^{1/2}\big), \quad (t,s)\in\mathbb{R}^2.$$

Theorem 3.1 *(i) The RF V_{k,γ_0} in (3.2) is well-defined for $1\le k<P$ as Itô-Wiener stochastic integral and has zero mean $\mathrm{E}V_{k,\gamma_0}(x,y)=0$ and finite variance $\mathrm{E}V^2_{k,\gamma_0}(x,y)=k!\|h(x,y;\cdot)\|_k^2$. Moreover, RF V_{k,γ_0} has stationary rectangular increments and satisfies the OSRF property:*

$$\{V_{k,\gamma_0}(\lambda x,\lambda^{\gamma_0}y),(x,y)\in\mathbb{R}^2_+\} \overset{\text{fdd}}{=} \{\lambda^{H(\gamma_0)}V_{k,\gamma_0}(x,y),(x,y)\in\mathbb{R}^2_+\}, \qquad \forall\lambda>0, \tag{3.4}$$

where $H(\gamma_0):=1+\gamma_0-kp_1/2$.
(ii) Let RFs Y and $X=A_k(Y)$ satisfy Assumptions (A1), (A2) and (A3)$_k$, $1\le k<P$. Then

$$\mathrm{Var}(S^X_{\lambda,\gamma_0}) \sim c(\gamma_0)\lambda^{2H(\gamma_0)}, \qquad c(\gamma_0):=\|h(1,1;\cdot)\|_k^2 \tag{3.5}$$

and

$$n^{-H(\gamma_0)}S^X_{\lambda,\gamma_0}(x,y) \xrightarrow{\text{fdd}} V_{\gamma_0}(x,y). \tag{3.6}$$

Next, we discuss the case $k<P$, $\gamma\ne\gamma_0$. This case is split into four subcases: (c1): $\gamma>\gamma_0, k>1/p_2$, (c2): $\gamma>\gamma_0, k<1/p_2$, (c3): $\gamma<\gamma_0, k>1/p_1$, and (c4): $\gamma<\gamma_0, k<1/p_1$ (the 'boundary' cases $k=1/p_i, i=1,2$ are more delicate and omitted, see Remark 3.2 below). Cases (c3) and (c4) are symmetric to (c1) and (c2) and essentially follow by exchanging the coordinates t and s. Introduce random processes Z_k^+ and Z_k^- with one-dimensional time:

$$Z_k^+(y) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2k}} h_+(y;(u,v)_k)\mathrm{d}^kW, \qquad Z_k^-(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2k}} h_-(x;(u,v)_k)\mathrm{d}^kW, \qquad x,y\ge 0, \tag{3.7}$$

where

$$h_+(y;(u,v)_k) := \int_0^y \prod_{i=1}^k a_\infty(u_i,s-v_i)\mathrm{d}s, \qquad h_-(y;(u,v)_k) := \int_0^x \prod_{i=1}^k a_\infty(t-u_i,v_i)\mathrm{d}t, \tag{3.8}$$

and $a_\infty(t,s)$ is defined in (3.3).

Theorem 3.2 *(i) Processes Z_k^+ and Z_k^- in (3.7) are well-defined for $1\le k<1/p_2$ and $1\le k<1/p_1$, respectively, as Itô-Wiener stochastic integrals. They have zero mean, finite variance, stationary increments and are self-similar with respective indices $H^+_{2k}:=1-kp_2/2\in(1/2,1)$ and $H^-_{1k}:=1-kp_1/2\in(1/2,1)$.*
(ii) Let RFs Y and $X=A_k(Y)$ satisfy Assumptions (A1), (A2) and (A3)$_k$, $1\le k<1/p_2$. Then for any $\gamma>\gamma_0$

$$\mathrm{Var}(S^X_{\lambda,\gamma}) \sim c(\gamma)\lambda^{2H(\gamma)}, \tag{3.9}$$

where $H(\gamma):=1+\gamma H^+_{2k}$ and $c(\gamma):=\|h_+(1;\cdot)\|_k^2$. Moreover,

$$\lambda^{-H(\gamma)}S^X_{\lambda,\gamma}(x,y) \xrightarrow{\text{fdd}} xZ_k^+(y). \tag{3.10}$$

(iii) Let RFs Y and $X = A_k(Y)$ satisfy Assumptions (A1), (A2) and (A3)$_k$, $1 \le k < 1/p_1$. Then for any $\gamma < \gamma_0$

$$\mathrm{Var}(S^X_{\lambda,\gamma}) \ \sim \ c(\gamma)\lambda^{2H(\gamma)}, \tag{3.11}$$

where $H(\gamma) := \gamma + H^-_{1k}$ and $c(\gamma) := \|h_-(1;\cdot)\|^2_k > 0$. Moreover,

$$\lambda^{-H(\gamma)} S^X_{\lambda,\gamma}(x,y) \ \stackrel{\mathrm{fdd}}{\longrightarrow} \ yZ^-_k(x). \tag{3.12}$$

REMARK 3.1 Processes $Z^{\pm}_k$ in (3.7) have a similar structure and properties to generalized Hermite processes discussed in [3] except that (3.7) are defined as k-tuple Itô-Wiener integrals with respect to white noise in $\mathbb{R}^2$ and not in $\mathbb{R}$ as in [3]. Following the terminology in [28], RFs $xZ^+_k(y)$ and $yZ^-_k(x)$ may be called a *generalized Hermite slide* since they represent a random surface 'sliding linearly to 0' along one of the coordinate on the plane from a generalized Hermite process indexed by the other coordinate. In the Gaussian case $k = 1$, a generalized Hermite slide agrees with a FBS B_{H_1,H_2} where one of the two parameters H_1, H_2 equals 1. Recall that a fractional Brownian sheet (FBS) $B_{H_1,H_2} = \{B_{H_1,H_2}(x,y), (x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2_+\}$ with parameters $0 < H_1, H_2 \le 1$ is a Gaussian process with zero mean and covariance function

$$\mathrm{E}B_{H_1,H_2}(x_1,y_1)B_{H_1,H_2}(x_2,y_2) = (1/4)(x_1^{2H_1} + x_2^{2H_1} - |x_1 - x_2|^{2H_1})(y_1^{2H_2} + y_2^{2H_2} - |y_1 - y_2|^{2H_2}). \tag{3.13}$$

Theorem 3.3 *(i) Let RFs Y and $X = A_k(Y)$ satisfy Assumptions (A1), (A2) and (A3)$_k$, $1/p_2 < k < P$. Then for any $\gamma > \gamma_0$*

$$\mathrm{Var}(S^X_{\lambda,\gamma}) \ \sim \ c(\gamma)\lambda^{2H(\gamma)}, \tag{3.14}$$

where $H(\gamma) := H^+_{1k} + \gamma/2$, $H^+_{1k} := 1 + \gamma_0/2 - kp_1/2 \in (1/2,1)$ and $c(\gamma) := \int_{(0,1]^2\times\mathbb{R}} \big((a_\infty \star a_\infty)(t_1 - t_2, s)\big)^k \mathrm{d}t_1\mathrm{d}t_2\mathrm{d}s > 0$. Moreover,

$$\lambda^{-H(\gamma)} S^X_{\lambda,\gamma}(x,y) \ \stackrel{\mathrm{fdd}}{\longrightarrow} \ c(\gamma)^{1/2} B_{H^+_{1k},1/2}(x,y). \tag{3.15}$$

(ii) Let RFs Y and $X = A_k(Y)$ satisfy Assumptions (A1), (A2) and (A3)$_k$, $1/p_1 < k < P$. Then for any $\gamma < \gamma_0$

$$\mathrm{Var}(S^X_{\lambda,\gamma}) \ \sim \ c(\gamma)\lambda^{2H(\gamma)}, \tag{3.16}$$

where $H(\gamma) := \gamma H^-_{2k} + 1/2$, $H^-_{2k} := 1 + 1/(2\gamma_0) - kp_2/2 \in (1/2,1)$ and $c(\gamma) := \int_{\mathbb{R}\times(0,1]^2} \big((a_\infty \star a_\infty)(t, s_1 - s_2)\big)^k \mathrm{d}t\mathrm{d}s_1\mathrm{d}s_2 > 0$. Moreover,

$$\lambda^{-H(\gamma)} S^X_{\lambda,\gamma}(x,y) \ \stackrel{\mathrm{fdd}}{\longrightarrow} \ c(\gamma)^{1/2} B_{1/2,H^-_{2k}}(x,y). \tag{3.17}$$

REMARK 3.2 Note $H^+_{1k} = 1$ ($kp_2 = 1$) and $H^-_{2k} = 1$ ($kp_1 = 1$). We expect that the convergences (3.15) and (3.17) remain true (modulus a logarithmic correction of normalization) in the 'boundary' cases $kp_2 = 1$ and $kp_1 = 1$ of Theorem 3.3 (i) and (ii) and the limit RFs in these cases agree with FBS $B_{1,1/2}$ or $B_{1/2,1}$, respectively, having both parameters equal to 1 or 1/2.

The next theorem discusses the case $k > P$.

Theorem 3.4 *Let RFs Y and $X = A_k(Y)$ satisfy Assumptions (A1), (A2) and (A3)$_k$ and $k > P$. Then for any $\gamma > 0$*

$$\mathrm{Var}(S^X_{\lambda,\gamma}) \ \sim \ \sigma_X^2 \lambda^{1+\gamma}, \tag{3.18}$$

where $\sigma_X^2 := \sum_{(t,s)\in\mathbb{Z}^2} \mathrm{Cov}(X(0,0), X(t,s)) \in (0,\infty)$. Moreover,

$$\lambda^{-(1+\gamma)/2} S^X_{\lambda,\gamma}(x,y) \quad \stackrel{\mathrm{fdd}}{\longrightarrow} \quad \sigma_X B_{1/2,1/2}(x,y). \tag{3.19}$$

Our last theorem extends the above results to general function G having Hermite rank k and Gaussian underlying RF Y.

Theorem 3.5 *Let $X = G(Y)$ satisfy Assumption (A4)$_k$. Assume w.l.g. that G has Hermite expansion $G(x) = H_k(x) + \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} c_j H_j(x)/j!$.*

(i) Let $1 \le k < P$. Then RF X satisfies all statements of Theorems 3.1-3.3.

(ii) Let $k > P$. Then RF X satisfies the statements of Theorem 3.4.

According to Theorems 3.2-3.3, the unbalanced scaling limits $V^X_\pm$ of RF $X = A_k(Y)$ satisfying Assumptions (A1)-(A3)$_k$ are given by

$$V^X_+(x,y) \ = \ \begin{cases} xZ^+_k(y), & kp_2 < 1, \\ c_+^{1/2} B_{H^+_{1k},1/2}(x,y), & kp_2 > 1, \end{cases} \qquad V^X_-(x,y) \ = \ \begin{cases} yZ^-_k(x), & kp_1 < 1, \\ c_-^{1/2} B_{1/2,H^-_{2k}}(x,y), & kp_1 > 1, \end{cases} \tag{3.20}$$

where $c_\pm \equiv c(\gamma) > 0$ are given constants. The covariance functions of RFs $V^X_\pm$ in (3.20) agree (modulus a constant) with the covariance of FBS B_{H_1,H_2} where at least one of the two parameters H_1, H_2 equals 1 or 1/2, namely $(H_1,H_2) = (1, H^+_{2k})$ if $kp_2 < 1$, $= (H^+_{1k}, 1/2)$ if $kp_2 > 1$ in the case of V^X_+, and $(H_1,H_2) = (H^-_{1k}, 1)$ if $kp_1 < 1$, $= (1/2, H^-_{2k})$ if $kp_1 > 1$ in the case of V^X_-. These facts and the explicit form of the covariance of FBS, see (3.13), imply that $V_+ \stackrel{\mathrm{fdd}}{\neq} aV_-$ $(\forall a > 0)$, for any k, p_1, p_2 in Theorems 3.2-3.3, yielding the following corollary.

Corollary 3.1 *Let RF $X = A_k(Y)$ satisfy Assumptions (A1), (A2) and (A3)$_k$, $1 \le k < P, kp_i \neq 1$, $i = 1, 2$. Then X exhibits scaling transition at $\gamma_0 = p_1/p_2$.*

4 Examples: fractionally integrated RFs

In this section we present two examples of linear fractionally integrated random fields Y in $\mathbb{Z}^2$ satisfying Assumptions (A1) and (A2).

Example 1. Isotropic fractionally integrated random field. Introduce the (discrete) Laplace operator $\Delta Y(t,s) := (1/4)\sum_{|u|+|v|=1}(Y(t+u,s+v)-Y(t,s))$ and a lattice isotropic fractionally integrated random field satisfying the equation:

$$(-\Delta)^d Y(t,s) \;=\; \varepsilon(t,s), \tag{4.1}$$

where $\{\varepsilon(t,s),(t,s)\in\mathbb{Z}^2\}$ are standard i.i.d. r.v.'s, $0<d<1/2$ is the order of fractional integration, $(1-z)^d=\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\psi_j(d)z^j, \psi_j(d):=\Gamma(j-d)/\Gamma(j+1)\Gamma(-d)$. More explicitly,

$$(-\Delta)^d Y(t,s) \;=\; \sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\psi_j(d)(1+\Delta)^j Y(t,s) \;=\; \sum_{(u,v)\in\mathbb{Z}^2} b(u,v)Y(t-u,s-v), \tag{4.2}$$

where $b(u,v):=\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\psi_j(d)p_j(u,v)$ and $p_j(u,v)$ are j-step transition probabilities of a symmetric nearest-neighbor random walk $\{W_k,k=0,1,\cdots\}$ on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ with equal 1-step probabilities $P(W_1=(u,v)|W_0=(0,0))=1/4, |u|+|v|=1$. Note $\sum_{(u,v)\in\mathbb{Z}^2}|b(u,v)|=\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}|\psi_j(d)|<\infty$, $d>0$ and therefore the l.h.s. of (4.2) is well-defined for any stationary random field $\{Y(t,s)\}$ with $\mathrm{E}|Y(0,0)|<\infty$. As shown in [18], for $0<d<1/2$ a stationary solution of (4.2) with zero-mean and finite variance can be defined as a moving-average random field:

$$Y(t,s)=(-\Delta)^{-d}\varepsilon(t,s) \;=\; \sum_{(u,v)\in\mathbb{Z}^2} a(u,v)\varepsilon(t-u,s-v), \tag{4.3}$$

with coefficients

$$a(u,v)=\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\psi_j(-d)p_j(u,v) \tag{4.4}$$

satisfying $\sum_{(u,v)\in\mathbb{Z}^2}a(u,v)^2<\infty$. Moreover, RF Y in (4.3) has an explicit spectral density $f(x,y)=(2\pi)^{-2}2^{-2d}|(1-\cos x)+(1-\cos y)|^{-2d}, (x,y)\in[-\pi,\pi]^2$ which behaves as const $(x^2+y^2)^{-2d}$ as $x^2+y^2\to 0$. According to ([18], Proposition 5.1), the moving-average coefficients in (4.4) satisfy the isotropic asymptotics:

$$a(t,s)=(A+o(1))(t^2+s^2)^{-(1-d)}, \quad t^2+s^2\to\infty,$$

where $A:=\pi^{-1}\Gamma(1-d)/\Gamma(d)$ and hence Assumption (A2) with $q_1=q_2=2(1-d)\in(1,2), Q=1/(1-d)\in(1,2)$ and a constant angular function $L_0(z)=A, z\in[-1,1]$.

Example 2. Anisotropic fractionally integrated random field. Consider the 'discrete heat operator' $\Delta_{1,2}Y(t,s)=Y(t,s)-\theta Y(t-1,s)-\frac{1-\theta}{2}(Y(t-1,s+1)+Y(t-1,s-1)), 0<\theta<1$ and a fractionally integrated random field satisfying

$$\Delta_{1,2}^d Y(t,s) \;=\; \varepsilon(t,s), \tag{4.5}$$

where $\{\varepsilon(t,s)\}$ are as in (4.1). Similarly to (4.3), a stationary solution of (4.5) can be written as a moving-average random field:

$$Y(t,s)=\Delta_{1,2}^{-d}\varepsilon(t,s) \;=\; \sum_{(u,v)\in\mathbb{Z}_+\times\mathbb{Z}} a(u,v)\varepsilon(t-u,s-v), \tag{4.6}$$

with coefficients

$$a(u,v)=\psi_u(-d)q_u(v) \tag{4.7}$$

where $q_u(v)$ are u-step transition probabilities of a random walk $\{W_u, u = 0, 1, \cdots\}$ on $\mathbb{Z}$ with 1-step probabilities $P(W_1 = v|W_0 = 0) = \theta$ if $v = 0$, $= (1-\theta)/2$ if $v = \pm 1$. As shown in [20], $\sum_{(u,v)\in\mathbb{Z}^2} a(t,s)^2 < \infty$ and the RF in (4.6) is well-defined for any $0 < d < 3/4, \theta \in [0,1)$; moreover, the spectral density $f(x,y)$ of (4.6) is singular at the origin: $f(x,y) \sim \text{const}\,(x^2 + (1-\theta)^2 y^4/4)^{-d}$, $(x,y) \to (0,0)$.

Proposition 4.1 *For any $0 < d < 3/4, 0 < \theta < 1$ the coefficients in (4.7) satisfy Assumption (A2) with $q_1 = 3/2 - d, q_2 = 2q_1$ and a continuous angular function $L_0(z), z \in [-1,1]$ given by*

$$L_0(z) \;=\; \begin{cases} \frac{z^{d-3/2}}{\Gamma(d)\sqrt{2\pi(1-\theta)}} \exp\big\{ - \frac{\sqrt{(1/z)^2-1}}{2(1-\theta)}\big\}, & 0 < z \le 1, \\ 0, & -1 \le z \le 0. \end{cases} \tag{4.8}$$

Remark 4.1 [7], [12] discussed fractionally integrated RFs satisfying the equation

$$\Delta_1^{d_1}\Delta_2^{d_2} Y(t,s) \;=\; \varepsilon(t,s), \tag{4.9}$$

where $\Delta_1 Y(t,s) := Y(t,s) - Y(t-1,s), \Delta_2 Y(t,s) := Y(t,s) - Y(t,s-1)$ are difference operators and $0 < d_1, d_2 < 1/2$ are parameters. Stationary solution of (4.9) is a moving-average RF in $Y(t,s) = \sum_{(u,v)\in\mathbb{Z}^2_+} a(u,v)\varepsilon(t-u, v-s)$ with coefficients $a(u,v) := \psi_u(-d_1)\psi_v(-d_2)$. Following the proof of Theorem 3.1 one can show that for *any* $\gamma > 0$ the (normalized) partial sums process of RF Y in (4.9) tends to a FBS depending on d_1, d_2 only, viz., $\lambda^{-H_1-\gamma H_2} S^Y_{\lambda,\gamma}(x,y) \xrightarrow{\text{fdd}} c(d_1)c(d_2) B_{H_1,H_2}(x,y)$, where $H_i = d_i + 1/2$ and $c(d_i) > 0$ are some constants. See ([31], Proposition 3.2) for related result. We conclude that the fractionally integrated RF in (4.9) featuring a 'separation of LRD along coordinate axes' does not exhibit scaling transition in contrast to models in (4.1) and (4.5).

5 Properties of convolutions of generalized homogeneous functions

For a given $\varpi > 0$ denote

$$\rho(t,s) := (|t|^2 + |s|^{2/\varpi})^{1/2}, \qquad \rho_+(t,s) := 1 \vee \rho(t,s), \quad (t,s) \in \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{5.1}$$

Let $f(t,s) = \rho(t,s)^{-h} L(t/\rho(t,s))$, where $h \in \mathbb{R}$ and $L = L(z), z \in [-1,1]$ is an arbitrary measurable function, then $f(t,s)$ satisfies the scaling property: $f(\lambda t, \lambda^\varpi s) = \lambda^{-h}\rho(t,s), (t,s) \in \mathbb{R}^2_0$ for each $\lambda > 0$. Such functions are called generalized homogeneous functions (see [15]).

We use the notation $[\phi_1 \star \phi_2](t,s) = \sum_{(u,v)\in\mathbb{Z}^2} \phi_1(u,v)\phi_2(t+u, s+v)$ for 'discrete' convolution of sequences $\phi_i = \{\phi_i(u,v), (u,v) \in \mathbb{Z}^2\} \in L^2(\mathbb{Z}^2), i = 1,2$ and $(\psi_1 \star \psi_2)(t,s) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \psi_1(u,v)\psi_2(t+u, s+v)\mathrm{d}u\mathrm{d}v$ for 'usual' convolution of functions $\psi_i = \{\psi_i(u,v), (u,v) \in \mathbb{R}^2\}, i = 1,2$. Note the symmetry $\phi_i(t,s) = \phi_i(t,-s), i = 1,2$ implies the symmetry $[\phi_1 \star \phi_2](t,s) = [\phi_1 \star \phi_2](t,-s), (\phi_1 \star \phi_2)(t,s) = (\phi_1 \star \phi_2)(t,-s)$ of convolutions.

Let $B_\delta(t,s) := \{(u,v) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |t-u| + |s-v| \le \delta\}$, $B^c_\delta(t,s) := \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_\delta(t,s)$.

Proposition 5.1 *(i) For any $\delta > 0, h > 0$,*

$$\int_{B_\delta(0,0)} \rho(t,s)^{-h}\mathrm{d}t\mathrm{d}s < \infty \iff h < 1 + \varpi \tag{5.2}$$

and

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}\int_{B_\delta^c(0,0)}\rho(t,s)^{-h}\mathrm{d}t\mathrm{d}s<\infty\\ \sum_{(t,s)\in\mathbb{Z}^2}\rho_+(t,s)^{-h}<\infty\end{array}\right\}\iff h>1+\varpi. \tag{5.3}$$

(ii) Let $h_i>0, i=1,2$, $h_1+h_2>1+\varpi$. Then there exists $C>0$ such that for any $(t,s)\in\mathbb{R}_0^2$

$$(\rho^{-h_1}\star\rho^{-h_2})(t,s) \leq C\rho(t,s)^{1+\varpi-h_1-h_2}, \quad h_i<1+\varpi,\ i=1,2, \tag{5.4}$$

$$(\rho_+^{-h_1}\star\rho^{-h_2})(t,s) \leq C\rho_+(t,s)^{-h_2}, \quad h_2<1+\varpi,\ h_1>1+\varpi, \tag{5.5}$$

$$(\rho_+^{-h_1}\star\rho_+^{-h_2})(t,s) \leq C\rho_+(t,s)^{-h_1\wedge h_2}, \quad h_i>1+\varpi,\ i=1,2. \tag{5.6}$$

Moreover, inequalities (5.4)-(5.6) *are also valid for 'discrete' convolution $[\rho_+^{-h_1}\star\rho_+^{-h_2}](t,s), (t,s)\in\mathbb{Z}^2$ with $\rho(t,s)$ on the r.h.s. of* (5.4) *replaced by $\rho_+(t,s)$.*

(iii) Let $a_i=a_i(t,s), (t,s)\in\mathbb{Z}^2, i=1,2$ satisfy $a_i(t,s)=\rho_+(t,s)^{-h_i}\big(L_i(t/\rho_+(t,s))+o(1)\big), |t|+|s|\to\infty$, where $0<h_i<1+\varpi, h_1+h_2>1+\varpi$, and $L_i(u)\not\equiv 0, u\in[-1,1]$ are bounded piecewise continuous functions, $i=1,2$. Let $a_{i\infty}(u,v):=\rho(u,v)^{-h_i}L_i(u/\rho(u,v)), (u,v)\in\mathbb{R}^2, i=1,2$. Then

$$[a_1\star a_2](t,s) \;=\; \rho_+(t,s)^{1+\varpi-h_1-h_2}\big(L_{12}(\tfrac{t}{\rho_+(t,s)})+o(1)\big), \quad |t|+|s|\to\infty, \tag{5.7}$$

where

$$L_{12}(z) \;:=\; (a_{1\infty}\star a_{2\infty})(z,(1-z^2)^{\varpi/2}) \;=\; \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} a_{1\infty}(u,v)a_{2\infty}(u+z,v+(1-z^2)^{\varpi/2})\mathrm{d}u\mathrm{d}v \tag{5.8}$$

is a bounded continuous function on the interval $z\in[-1,1]$. Moreover, if $L_1(z)=L_2(z)\geq 0$ then $L_{12}(z)$ in (5.8) *is strictly positive on $[-1,1]$.*

(iv) Let $b(t,s):=\rho_+(t,s)^{-h}\big(L(t/\rho_+(t,s))+o(1)\big), |t|+|s|\to\infty, (t,s)\in\mathbb{Z}^2$, $b_\infty(t,s):=\rho(t,s)^{-h}L(t/\rho(t,s))$, $(t,s)\in\mathbb{R}^2$ where $0<h<1+\varpi$ and $L(u)\geq 0, u\in[-1,1]$ is a continuous function. Then for any $\gamma>0$

$$B_\lambda(\gamma) \;:=\; \sum_{(t_i,s_i)\in K_{[\lambda,\lambda^\gamma]},i=1,2} b(t_1-t_2,s_1-s_2) \;\sim\; \mathcal{C}(\gamma)\lambda^{2\mathcal{H}(\gamma)}, \qquad \lambda\to\infty, \tag{5.9}$$

where

$$\mathcal{H}(\gamma) \;:=\; \begin{cases}1+\varpi-\frac{h}{2},\\ 1+\gamma-\frac{\gamma h}{2\varpi},\\ 1+\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{h-\varpi}{2},\\ 1+\gamma-\frac{h}{2},\\ \frac{1}{2}+\gamma-\frac{\gamma(h-1)}{2\varpi},\end{cases} \qquad \mathcal{C}(\gamma) \;:=\; \begin{cases}\int_{(0,1]^4} b_\infty(t_1-t_2,s_1-s_2)\mathrm{d}t_1\mathrm{d}t_2\mathrm{d}s_1\mathrm{d}s_2, & \text{(I)}\\ \int_{(0,1]^2} b_\infty(0,s_1-s_2)\mathrm{d}s_1\mathrm{d}s_2, & \text{(II)}\\ \int_{(0,1]^2\times\mathbb{R}} b_\infty(t_1-t_2,s)\mathrm{d}t_1\mathrm{d}t_2\mathrm{d}s, & \text{(III)}\\ \int_{(0,1]^2} b_\infty(t_1-t_2,0)\mathrm{d}t_1\mathrm{d}t_2, & \text{(IV)}\\ \int_{\mathbb{R}\times(0,1]^2} b_\infty(t,s_1-s_2)\mathrm{d}t\mathrm{d}s_1\mathrm{d}s_2, & \text{(V)}\end{cases} \tag{5.10}$$

in respective cases (I)*: $\gamma=\varpi$,* (II)*: $\gamma>\varpi, h<\varpi$,* (III)*: $\gamma>\varpi, h>\varpi$,* (IV)*: $\gamma<\varpi, h<1$ and* (V)*: $\gamma<\varpi, h>1$.*

6 Covariance structure of subordinated anisotropic RFs

In this section from Proposition 5.1 with $\varpi = \gamma_0$ we obtain the asymptotic form of the covariance function of $r_X(t,s) := \mathrm{E}X(0,0)X(t,s)$ and the asymptotics of the variance of anisotropic partial sums $S^X_{\lambda,\gamma}$ of subordinated RF $X = A_k(Y)$.

Proposition 6.1 *Let RF $X = A_k(Y)$ satisfy assumptions (A1), (A2) and $(A3)_k$.*

(i) Let $1 \le k < P$. Then

$$r_X(t,s) \;=\; \rho(t,s)^{-kp_1}\big(L_X(t/\rho(t,s)) + o(1)\big), \qquad |t|+|s| \to \infty, \tag{6.1}$$

where $L_X(z) := (a_\infty \star a_\infty)^k(z, (1-z^2)^{\gamma_0/2})$, $z \in [-1,1]$ is a strictly positive continuous function and a_∞ is defined in (3.3)*. Moreover, $X(t,s) = Y^{\bullet k}(t,s) + \mathcal{Z}(t,s)$, where $\mathcal{Z}(t,s)$ is defined in* (2.5) *and*

$$r_{\mathcal{Z}}(t,s) \;=\; O(\rho(t,s)^{-2q_1}) \;=\; o(\rho(t,s)^{-kp_1}), \qquad |t|+|s| \to \infty. \tag{6.2}$$

(ii) Let $k > P$. Then

$$r_X(t,s) \;=\; O\big(\rho(t,s)^{-(kp_1)\wedge(2q_1)}\big), \qquad |t|+|s| \to \infty. \tag{6.3}$$

Clearly, (6.1) implies $C_1\rho(t,s)^{-kp_1} \le r_X(t,s) \le C_2\rho(t,s)^{-kp_1}$ for all $|t|+|s| > C_3$ and some $0 < C_i < \infty, i = 1,2,3$. The last fact together with Proposition 5.1 (i) implies the following corollary.

Corollary 6.1 *Let $X = A_k(Y)$, $1 \le k < P$ be the subordinated RF defined in Proposition 6.1 and satisfying the conditions therein.*

(i) Let $1 \le k < P$. Then $\sum_{(t,s)\in\mathbb{Z}^2} |r_X(t,s)| = \infty$. Moreover, $\sum_{s\in\mathbb{Z}} |r_X(0,s)| = \infty \iff kp_2 \le 1$ and $\sum_{t\in\mathbb{Z}} |r_X(t,0)| = \infty \iff kp_1 \le 1$.

(ii) Let $k > P$. Then $\sum_{(t,s)\in\mathbb{Z}^2} |r_X(t,s)| < \infty$.

Remark 6.1 Following the terminology in [28], we say that a covariance stationary RF $X = \{X(t,s), (t,s) \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}$ has *vertical LRD property* (respectively, *horizontal LRD property*) if $\sum_{s\in\mathbb{Z}} |r_X(0,s)| = \infty$ (respectively, $\sum_{t\in\mathbb{Z}} |r_X(t,0)| = \infty$). From Corollary 6.1 we see the dichotomy of the limit distribution in Theorems 3.2 - 3.3 at points $kp_2 = 1$ at $kp_1 = 1$ is related to the change of vertical and horizontal LRD properties of the subordinated RF $X = A_k(Y)$.

Corollary 6.2 *Let $X(t,s) = A_k(Y(t,s)) = Y^{\bullet k}(t,s) + \mathcal{Z}(t,s)$, $1 \le k < P$ be the subordinated RF defined in Proposition 6.1 and satisfying the conditions therein. Then for any $\gamma > 0$*

$$\mathrm{Var}\big(S^X_{\lambda,\gamma}\big) \;\sim\; \mathrm{Var}\big(S^{Y^{\bullet k}}_{\lambda,\gamma}\big) \;\sim\; c(\gamma)\lambda^{2H(\gamma)}, \qquad \lambda \to \infty \tag{6.4}$$

and

$$\mathrm{Var}(S^{\mathcal{Z}}_{\lambda,\gamma}) \;=\; O(\lambda^{1+\gamma}), \tag{6.5}$$

where $H(\gamma) \in ((1+\gamma)/2, 1+\gamma)$ and $c(\gamma)$ are defined in Theorems 3.1-3.3.

7 Proofs of Theorems 3.1-3.5

We use the criterion in Proposition 7.1 for the convergence in distribution of off-diagonal polygonal forms towards Itô-Wiener integral which is a straightforward extension of ([14], Proposition 14.3.2).

Let $L^2(\mathbb{Z}^{2k})$ be the class of all real functions $g = g((u,v)_k), (u,v)_k \in \mathbb{Z}^{2k}$ with $\sum_{(u,v)_k \in \mathbb{Z}^{2k}} g((u,v)_k)^2 < \infty$ and $Q_k(g) := \sum^{\bullet}_{(u,v)_k} g((u,v)_k)\varepsilon(u_1,v_1)\cdots\varepsilon(u_k,v_k), g \in L^2(\mathbb{Z}^{2k})$ be a k-tuple off-diagonal form in i.i.d. r.v.'s $\{\varepsilon(u,v)\}$ satisfying Assumption (A1). For $g_{\lambda,\gamma} \in L^2(\mathbb{Z}^{2k})$ $(\lambda > 0, \gamma > 0)$ define a step function $\widetilde{g}_{\lambda,\gamma} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2k})$ by

$$\widetilde{g}_{\lambda,\gamma}((u,v)_k) \;:=\; \lambda^{k\gamma(1+\gamma_0^{-1})/2} g_{\lambda,\gamma}([\lambda^{\gamma/\gamma_0}u_1],[\lambda^{\gamma}v_1],\cdots,[\lambda^{\gamma/\gamma_0}u_k],[\lambda^{\gamma}v_k]), \qquad (u,v)_k \in \mathbb{R}^{2k}. \tag{7.1}$$

Proposition 7.1 *Assume that there exists $h_\gamma \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2k})$ such that $\lim_{\lambda\to\infty}\|\widetilde{g}_{\lambda,\gamma} - h_\gamma\|_k \to 0$. Then $Q_k(g_{\lambda,\gamma}) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{d}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2k}} h_\gamma((u,v)_k)\mathrm{d}^k W$ $(\lambda\to\infty)$.*

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Let $\rho(t,s) := (|t|^2 + |s|^{2/\gamma_0})^{1/2}$, $(t,s) \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

(i) Let us show that the stochastic integral $V_{k,\gamma_0}(x,y)$ is well-defined or $\|h(x,y;\cdot)\|_k < \infty$. where $h(x,y;(u,v)_k)$ is defined in (3.3). It suffices to consider the case $x = y = 1$. By Proposition 5.1, $\|h(1,1;\cdot)\|_k^2 = \int_{(0,1]^4}((a_\infty \star a_\infty)(t_1-t_2,s_1-s_2))^k \mathrm{d}t_1\mathrm{d}t_2\mathrm{d}s_1\mathrm{d}s_2 \le \int_{(0,1]^4}\rho(t_1-t_2,s_1-s_2)^{-kp_1}\mathrm{d}t_1\mathrm{d}t_2\mathrm{d}s_1\mathrm{d}s_2 < \infty$ since $kp_1 < 1+\gamma_0 = 1 + p_1/p_2$ or $k < P$ holds. The self-similarity property in (3.4) follows by scaling properties $a_\infty(\lambda t, \lambda^{\gamma_0}s) = \lambda^{q_1}a_\infty(t,s)$, $\{W(\mathrm{d}\lambda u, \mathrm{d}\lambda^{\gamma_0}v)\} \stackrel{\mathrm{fdd}}{=} \{\lambda^{(1+\gamma_0)/2}W(\mathrm{d}u,\mathrm{d}v)\}$ of the integrand and the white noise, and the change of variables rules for multiple Itô-Wiener integral, see [8], also ([14], Proposition 14.3.5).

(ii) Relation (3.5) is proved in Proposition 6.2. Let us prove (3.6). Recall the decomposition $X(t,s) = Y^{\bullet k}(t,s) + \mathcal{Z}(t,s)$ in Corollary 6.2. Using $\mathrm{Var}(S^{\mathcal{Z}}_{\lambda,\gamma_0}) = O(\lambda^{1+\gamma_0}) = o(\lambda^{2H(\gamma_0)})$, see (6.5), relation (3.6) follows from

$$Q_k(g_{\lambda,\gamma_0}(x,y;\cdot)) \;=\; \lambda^{-H(\gamma_0)} \sum_{(t,s)\in K_{[\lambda x,\lambda^{\gamma_0}y]}} Y^{\bullet k}(t,s) \quad \xrightarrow{\mathrm{fdd}} \quad V_{\gamma_0}(x,y), \tag{7.2}$$

where

$$g_{\lambda,\gamma_0}(x,y;(u,v)_k) \;:=\; \lambda^{-H(\gamma_0)} \sum_{(t,s)\in K_{[\lambda x,\lambda^{\gamma_0}y]}} a(t-u_1,s-v_1)\cdots a(t-u_k,s-v_k), \qquad (u,v)_k \in \mathbb{Z}^{2k}. \tag{7.3}$$

Using Proposition 7.1 and Cramér-Wold device, relation (7.2) follows from

$$\lim_{\lambda\to\infty}\|\sum\nolimits_{i=1}^m \theta_i\big(\widetilde{g}_{\lambda,\gamma_0}(x_i,y_i;\cdot) - h(x_i,y_i;\cdot)\big)\|_k \;=\; 0, \tag{7.4}$$

for any $m \ge 1$ and any $\theta_i \in \mathbb{R}, (x_i,y_i) \in \mathbb{R}^2_+, 1 \le i \le m$, where the limit function $h(x,y;(u,v)_k)$ is given in (3.3). We restrict the subsequent proof of (7.4) to the case $m = \theta_1 = 1, (x_1,y_1) = (x,y)$ since the general case of (7.4) follows analogously. Using (2.1), (7.3), (7.1) and notation $a_\lambda(t,s) := (\lambda^{-1}\rho(t,s))^{-q_1}\big(L_0(t/\lambda^{-1}\vee\rho(t,s)) + o(1)\big)$, $\lambda\to\infty$ and $\lambda' := \lambda^{\gamma_0}$ similarly to (8.24) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{g}_{\lambda,\gamma_0}(x,y;(u,v)_k) \;&=\; \int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\prod_{i=1}^k a_\lambda\big(\tfrac{[\lambda t]-[\lambda u]}{\lambda},\tfrac{[\lambda' s]-[\lambda' v]}{\lambda'}\big)\mathbf{1}\big(([\lambda t],[\lambda' s]) \in (0,\lambda x]\times(0,\lambda' y]\big)\\ &\to\; h(x,y;(u,v)_k)\end{aligned} \tag{7.5}$$

point-wise for any $(u,v)_k \in \mathbb{R}^{2k}, (u_i,v_i) \neq (u_j,v_j)\,(i \neq j)$ fixed. We use a similar bound to (8.20), viz.,

$$\tfrac{1}{\lambda} \vee \rho\big(\tfrac{[\lambda t]-[\lambda u]}{\lambda}, \tfrac{[\lambda' s]-[\lambda' v]}{\lambda'}\big) \;\geq\; c\rho(t-u, s-v), \quad \forall\, t,u,s,v \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \exists c>0, \tag{7.6}$$

implying the dominated bound

$$|\widetilde{g}_{\lambda,\gamma_0}(x,y;(u,v)_k)| \;\; \leq C \int_{(0,2x]\times(0,2y]} \prod_{i=1}^k \rho(t-u_i, s-v_i)^{-q_1} \mathrm{d}t\mathrm{d}s \;\; =: \;\; \bar{g}(x,y:(u,v)_k)$$

with $\|\bar{g}(x,y;\cdot)\|_k < \infty$ so that (7.4) follows from (7.5) and Proposition 5.1 by the dominated convergence theorem. Theorem 3.1 is proved. □

Proof of Theorem 3.2. As noted in Sec. 3, part (iii) follows by the same argument as part (ii) by exchanging the coordinates t and s and we omit the details.

(i) Let us show that the stochastic integral in (3.7) is well-defined or $\|h_+(y;\cdot)\|_k < \infty$, where $h_+(y;(u,v)_k)$ is defined in (3.8). Indeed by Proposition 5.1 $\|h_+(y;\cdot)\|_k^2 = \int_{(0,1]^2} ((a_\infty \star a_\infty)(0, s_1-s_2))^k \mathrm{d}s_1\mathrm{d}s_2 \leq\; C \int_{(0,1]^2} \rho(0,s_1-s_2)^{-kp_1}\mathrm{d}s_1\mathrm{d}s_2 \leq C\int_{[-1,1]} |s|^{-kp_2}\mathrm{d}s \;<\; \infty$ since $kp_2 < 1$. The remaining facts in (i) follow similarly as in the proof of Theorem 3.1(i).

(ii) Relation (3.9) is proved in Corollary 6.2. Similarly to the proof of (3.6), the weak convergence in (3.10) follows from

$$Q_k(g_{\lambda,\gamma}(x,y;\cdot)) \;=\; \lambda^{-H(\gamma)} \sum_{(t,s)\in K_{[\lambda x, \lambda^\gamma y]}} Y^{\bullet k}(t,s) \quad \xrightarrow{\text{fdd}} \quad x Z_+(y), \tag{7.7}$$

where

$$g_{\lambda,\gamma}(x,y;(u,v)_k) \;:=\; \lambda^{-H(\gamma)} \sum_{(t,s)\in K_{[\lambda x, \lambda^\gamma y]}} a(t-u_1, s-v_1)\cdots a(t-u_k, s-v_k), \qquad (u,v)_k \in \mathbb{Z}^{2k}. \tag{7.8}$$

Again, we restrict the proof of (7.7) to one-dimensional convergence at $(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2_+$. By Proposition 7.1 this follows from

$$\lim_{\lambda\to\infty} \|\widetilde{g}_{\lambda,\gamma}(x,y;\cdot) - x h_+(y;\cdot)\|_k \;=\; 0, \tag{7.9}$$

where, with $\lambda' := \lambda^\gamma, \lambda'' := \lambda^{\gamma/\gamma_0} \gg \lambda, a_{\lambda''}(t,s) := ((\lambda'')^{-1} \vee \rho(t,s))^{-q_1}(L_0(t/((\lambda'')^{-1}\vee\rho(t,s))) + o(1))$,

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{g}_{\lambda,\gamma}(x,y;(u,v)_k) \;\; &= \;\; \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \prod_{i=1}^k a_{\lambda''}\big(\tfrac{[\lambda t]-[\lambda'' u_i]}{\lambda''}, \tfrac{[\lambda' s]-[\lambda' v_i]}{\lambda'}\big) \mathbf{1}\big(([\lambda t],[\lambda' s]) \in (0,\lambda x]\times(0,\lambda' y]\big)\mathrm{d}t\mathrm{d}s \\ &\to \;\; x h_+(y;(u,v)_k) \end{aligned} \tag{7.10}$$

point-wise for any $(u,v)_k \in \mathbb{R}^{2k}, (u_i,v_i) \neq (u_j,v_j)\,(i \neq j)$ fixed.

The dominating convergence argument to prove (7.9) from (7.10) uses Pratt's lemma [29], as follows. Similarly to (7.6) note that

$$\tfrac{1}{\lambda''} \vee \rho\big(\tfrac{[\lambda t]-[\lambda'' u]}{\lambda''}, \tfrac{[\lambda' s]-[\lambda' v]}{\lambda'}\big) \;\geq\; c\rho((\lambda t/\lambda'')-u, s-v), \quad \forall\, t,u,s,v \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \exists c>0$$

and hence

$$|\widetilde{g}_{\lambda,\gamma}(x,y;(u,v)_k)| \;\le\; C\int_{(0,2x]\times(0,2y]}\prod_{i=1}^{k}\rho((\lambda t/\lambda'')-u_i,s-v_i)^{-q_1}\mathrm{d}t\mathrm{d}s \;=:\; CG_\lambda((u,v)_k)$$

with $C>0$ independent of $\lambda>0,(u,v)_k\in\mathbb{R}^{2k}$. Clearly, $\lim_{\lambda\to\infty}G_\lambda((u,v)_k)=G((u,v)_k):=2x\int_{(0,2y]}\prod_{i=1}^{k}\rho(-u_i,s-v_i)^{-q_1}\mathrm{d}s$ point-wise in $\mathbb{R}^{2k}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\|G_\lambda\|_k^2 &= \int_{(0,2x]^2\times(0,2y]^2}\big((\rho^{-q_1}\star\rho^{-q_1})((\lambda/\lambda'')(t_1-t_2),s_1-s_2)\big)^k\mathrm{d}t_1\mathrm{d}t_2\mathrm{d}s_1\mathrm{d}s_2\\ &\to \int_{(0,2x]^2\times(0,2y]^2}\big((\rho^{-q_1}\star\rho^{-q_1})(0,s_1-s_2)\big)^k\mathrm{d}t_1\mathrm{d}t_2\mathrm{d}s_1\mathrm{d}s_2 \;=\; \|G\|_k^2<\infty\end{aligned}$$

by Proposition 5.1 and condition $1\le k<1/p_2$, or $p_2=q_2(2-Q)<1/k$. Thus, application of [29] proves (7.9). Theorem 3.2 is proved. □

To prove Theorem 3.3 we use approximation by m-dependent variables and the following CLT for triangular array of m-dependent r.v.'s.

Lemma 7.1 *Let $\{\xi_{ni},1\le i\le N_n\},n\ge1$ be a triangular array of m-dependent r.v.'s with zero mean and finite variance. Assume that: (L1) $\xi_{in},1\le i\le N_n$ are identically distributed for any $n\ge1$, (L2) $\xi_n:=\xi_{n1}\xrightarrow{\mathrm{d}}\xi,\mathrm{E}\xi_n^2\to\mathrm{E}\xi^2<\infty$ for some r.v. ξ and (L3) $\mathrm{Var}(\sum_{i=1}^{N_n}\xi_{ni})\sim\sigma^2N_n,\sigma^2>0$. Then $N_n^{-1/2}\sum_{i=1}^{N_n}\xi_{ni}\xrightarrow{\mathrm{d}}N(0,\sigma^2)$.*

Proof. W.l.g., we can assume $N_n=n$ in the subsequent proof. We use the CLT due to Orey [25]. Accordingly, let $\xi_{ni}^\tau:=\xi_{ni}\mathbf{1}(|\xi_{ni}|\le\tau n^{1/2}),\alpha_{ni}^\tau:=\mathrm{E}\xi_{ni}^\tau,\sigma_{nij}^\tau:=\mathrm{Cov}(\xi_{ni}^\tau,\xi_{nj}^\tau)$. It suffices to show that for any $\tau>0$ the following conditions in [25] are satisfied: (O1) $n^{-1/2}\sum_{i=1}^n\alpha_{ni}^\tau\to0$, (O2) $n^{-1}\sum_{i,j=1}^n\sigma_{nij}^\tau\to\sigma^2$, (O3) $n^{-1}\sum_{i,j=1}^n\sigma_{nii}^\tau=O(1)$, and (O4) $\sum_{i=1}^n\mathrm{P}(|\xi_{ni}|>\tau n^{1/2})\to0$.
Consider (O1), or $n^{1/2}\alpha_n^\tau\to0,\alpha_n^\tau:=\alpha_{n1}^\tau$. We have $0=n^{1/2}\mathrm{E}\xi_n=n^{1/2}\alpha_n^\tau+\kappa_n$, where $|\kappa_n|:=n^{1/2}|\mathrm{E}\xi_n\mathbf{1}(|\xi_n|>\tau n^{1/2})|\le\tau^{-1}\mathrm{E}\xi_n^2\mathbf{1}(|\xi_n|>\tau n^{1/2})$. Therefore, (O1) follows from

$$\mathrm{E}\xi_n^2\mathbf{1}(|\xi_n|>\tau n^{1/2})\;\to\;0. \tag{7.11}$$

Using the Skorohod representation theorem [32] w.l.g. we can assume that r.v.s $\xi,\xi_n,n\ge1$ are defined on the same probability space and $\xi_n\to\xi$ almost surely. The latter fact together with (L2) and Pratt's lemma [29] implies that $\mathrm{E}|\xi_n^2-\xi^2|\to0$ and hence (7.11) follows due to $\mathrm{P}(|\xi_n|>\tau n^{1/2})\to0$, see ([23], Ch.2, Prop.5.3). The above argument also implies (O4) since $\mathrm{P}(|\xi_n|>\tau n^{1/2})\le\tau^{-1}n^{-1}\mathrm{E}\xi_n^2\mathbf{1}(|\xi_n|>\tau n^{1/2})$ by Markov's inequality. (O3) is immediate from (L1) and (L2). Finally, (O2) follows from (L3), (O1) and

$$n^{-1}\sum_{1\le i,j\le n,|i-j|\le m}\mathrm{E}(\xi_{ni}\xi_{nj}-\xi_{ni}^\tau\xi_{nj}^\tau)\;\to\;0. \tag{7.12}$$

Let $\widetilde{\xi}_{ni}^\tau:=\xi_{ni}-\xi_{ni}^\tau$. Since $|\mathrm{E}(\xi_{ni}\xi_{nj}-\xi_{ni}^\tau\xi_{nj}^\tau)|\le|\mathrm{E}(\widetilde{\xi}_{ni}^\tau\xi_{nj}^\tau+\xi_{ni}^\tau\widetilde{\xi}_{nj}^\tau+\widetilde{\xi}_{ni}^\tau\widetilde{\xi}_{nj}^\tau)|\le C\mathrm{E}^{1/2}\xi_n^2\mathbf{1}(|\xi_n|>\tau n^{1/2})$, relation (7.12) follows from (7.11). Lemma 7.1 is proved. □

Proof of Theorem 3.3. Again, we prove part (i) only since part (ii) follows similarly by exchanging the coordinates t and s.

Relation (3.11) is proved in Proposition 6.2. Let us prove (3.12). Similarly as in the case of the previous theorems, we shall restrict ourselves with the proof of one-dimensional convergence at $(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2_+$. For $m \geq 1, \lambda > 0$ define stationary RFs

$$\begin{aligned} X_m(t,s) &:= A_k(Y_m(t,s)), \qquad \text{where} \\ Y_m(t,s) &:= \sum_{(u,v)\in\mathbb{Z}^2:|s-v|\leq[\lambda^{\gamma_0}]m} a(t-u,s-v)\varepsilon(u,v), \end{aligned} \tag{7.13}$$

and where A_k stands for the Appell polynomial of degree k relative to the distribution of $Y_m(t,s)$. Note $X_m(t_1,s_1)$ and $X_m(t_2,s_2)$ are independent if $|s_1-s_2| > 2[\lambda^{\gamma_0}]m$. Then

$$S^{X_m}_{\lambda,\gamma}(x,y) := \sum_{(t,s)\in K_{[\lambda x,\lambda^\gamma y]}} X_m(t,s) = \sum_{i=0}^N U_{\lambda,m}(i) \tag{7.14}$$

where $N := [[\lambda^\gamma y]/[\lambda^{\gamma_0}]] = O(\lambda^{\gamma-\gamma_0})$ and

$$U_{\lambda,m}(i) := \sum_{1\leq t\leq \lambda x} \sum_{i[\lambda^{\gamma_0}]<s\leq(i+1)[\lambda^{\gamma_0}]} X_m(t,s). \tag{7.15}$$

Note $U_{\lambda,m}(i)$ and $U_{\lambda,m}(j)$ are independent provided $|i-j| > 2m$ hence (7.14) is a sum of $2m$-dependent r.v.'s. The one-dimensional convergence in (3.12) follows from standard Slutsky's argument (see e.g. [14], Lemma 4.2.1) and the following lemma. Theorem 3.3 is proved. □

Lemma 7.2 *Under the conditions and notation of Theorem 3.3 (i), for any $\gamma > \gamma_0$ and any $m = 1, 2, \cdots$*

$$\mathrm{Var}(S^{X_m}_{\lambda,\gamma}(x,y)) \sim \sigma^2_m(x,y)\lambda^{2H(\gamma)} \qquad \textit{and} \tag{7.16}$$

$$\lambda^{-H(\gamma)} S^{X_m}_{\lambda,\gamma}(x,y) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{d}} N(0,\sigma^2_m(x,y)) \quad \textit{as} \quad \lambda\to\infty, \tag{7.17}$$

where $\sigma^2_m(x,y)$ is defined in (7.19) *below. Moreover,*

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \limsup_{\lambda\to\infty} \lambda^{-2H(\gamma)} \mathrm{Var}(S^X_{\lambda,\gamma}(x,y) - S^{X_m}_{\lambda,\gamma}(x,y)) = 0. \tag{7.18}$$

Proof. By adapting the argument in the proof of (3.11) and Proposition 5.1 (iv), Case (III), we can show the limits

$$\lambda^{-2H(\gamma)}\mathrm{Var}(S^{X_m}_{\lambda,\gamma}(x,y)) \to y\int_{(0,x]^2\times\mathbb{R}} \big((a_{\infty,m}\star a_{\infty,m})(t_1-t_2,s)\big)^k \mathrm{d}t_1\mathrm{d}t_2\mathrm{d}s =: \sigma^2_m(x,y) \tag{7.19}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda^{-2H(\gamma)}\mathrm{Var}(S^X_{\lambda,\gamma}(x,y) - S^{X_m}_{\lambda,\gamma}(x,y)) \\ &= \lambda^{-2H(\gamma)} \sum_{(t_i,s_i)\in K_{[\lambda x,\lambda^\gamma y]},i=1,2} \big\{\mathrm{Cov}(X(t_1,s_1),X(t_2,s_2)) - \mathrm{Cov}(X(t_1,s_1),X_m(t_2,s_2)) \\ &\qquad\qquad - \mathrm{Cov}(X_m(t_1,s_1),X(t_2,s_2)) + \mathrm{Cov}(X_m(t_1,s_1),X_m(t_2,s_2))\big\} \\ &\to y\int_{(0,x^2]\times\mathbb{R}} G_m(t_1-t_2,s)\mathrm{d}t_1\mathrm{d}t_2\mathrm{d}s, \qquad \lambda\to\infty, \end{aligned} \tag{7.20}$$

where $G_m(t,s) := ((a_\infty \star a_\infty)(t,s))^k - ((a_\infty \star a_{\infty,m})(t,s))^k - ((a_{\infty,m} \star a_\infty)(t,s))^k + ((a_{\infty,m} \star a_{\infty,m})(t,s))^k$ and

$$a_{\infty,m}(t,s) \;:=\; L_0(t/\rho(t,s))\rho(t,s)^{-q_1}\mathbf{1}(|s|\le m), \quad (t,s)\in\mathbb{R}^2. \tag{7.21}$$

is a 'truncated' version of $a_\infty(t,s)$ in (3.3). Since $|G_m(t,s)| \le 4(a_\infty \star a_\infty)(t,s))^k$ and $G_m(t,s)$ vanishes with $m\to\infty$ for any fixed $(t,s)\neq(0,0)$, (7.18) follows from (7.20) by the dominated convergence theorem.

The proof of (7.17) uses Lemma 7.1. Accordingly, let $N_\lambda := [[\lambda^\gamma y]/[\lambda^{\gamma_0}]]$ and $\xi_{\lambda i} := \lambda^{-H(\gamma_0)}U_{\lambda,m}(i)$, where $H(\gamma_0) = 1+\gamma_0 - kp_1/2$ is the same as in Thm 3.1 and $U_{\lambda,m}(i)$ are $2m$-dependent r.v.'s defined in (7.15). Note $U_{\lambda,m}(i), i=1,\cdots,N_\lambda-1$ are identically distributed and $\lambda^{H(\gamma_0)}N_\lambda^{1/2}\sim\lambda^{H(\gamma)}y^{1/2}$. Thus, condition (L1) of Lemma 7.1 for $\xi_{\lambda i}, 1\le i\le N_\lambda-1$ is satisfied and (L3) follows from $\mathrm{Var}(\sum_{i=1}^{N_\lambda-1}\xi_{\lambda i}) \sim \mathrm{Var}(S^X_{\lambda,\gamma}(x,y)) \sim c_m(\gamma)x^{2H_{1k}}y$, see (7.16). Finally, condition (L2), or

$$\xi_{\lambda,1} \;=\; \lambda^{-H(\gamma_0)}U_{\lambda,m}(1) \;\stackrel{\mathrm{d}}{\longrightarrow}\; \xi, \qquad \mathrm{E}\xi^2_{\lambda,1} \;\to\; \mathrm{E}\xi^2 \tag{7.22}$$

follows similarly as in Theorem 3.1 with the limit r.v. ξ given by the k-tuple Itô-Wiener integral:

$$\xi := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2k}}\Big\{\int_0^x\int_0^1\prod_{\ell=1}^k a_{\infty,m}(t-u_\ell,s-v_\ell)\,\mathrm{d}t\mathrm{d}s\Big\}\mathrm{d}^kW$$

and $a_{\infty,m}(t,s)$ defined in (7.21). This proves (7.17) and Lemma 7.2, too. □

Proof of Theorem 3.4. The proof is an adaptation of the proof of CLT in ([14], Theorem 4.8.1) for sums of 'off-diagonal' polynomial forms with one-dimensional 'time' parameter. Define

$$X_m(t,s) \;:=\; A_k(Y_m(t,s)), \qquad Y_m(t,s) \;:=\; \sum_{(u,v)\in\mathbb{Z}^2:|t-u|+|s-v|\le m} a(t-u,s-v)\varepsilon(u,v), \tag{7.23}$$

where A_k stands for the Appell polynomial of degree k relative to the distribution of $Y_m(t,s)$. Note the truncation level m in (7.23) does not depend on λ in contrast to the truncation level $m[\lambda^{\gamma_0}]$ in (7.13). Similarly to Lemma 7.2 it suffices to prove for any $\gamma>0, m=1,2,\cdots$

$$\mathrm{Var}(S^{X_m}_{\lambda,\gamma}(x,y)) \;\sim\; xy\sigma^2_{X_m}\lambda^{1+\gamma}, \quad \lambda^{-(1+\gamma)/2}S^{X_m}_{\lambda,\gamma}(x,y) \;\stackrel{\mathrm{d}}{\longrightarrow}\; N(0,xy\sigma^2_{X_m}) \tag{7.24}$$

$$\lim_{m\to\infty}\limsup_{\lambda\to\infty}\lambda^{-(1+\gamma)}\mathrm{Var}(S^X_{\lambda,\gamma}(x,y) - S^{X_m}_{\lambda,\gamma}(x,y)) \;=\; 0. \tag{7.25}$$

where $\sigma^2_{X_m} := \sum_{(t,s)\in\mathbb{Z}^2} r_{X_m}(t,s)$ and $r_{X_m}(t,s) := \mathrm{Cov}(X_m(0,0),X_m(t,s))$. Note $X_m(t_1,s_1)$ and $X_m(t_2,s_2)$ are independent if $|t_1-t_2|+|s_1-s_2|>2m$. Therefore $\sum_{(t,s)\in\mathbb{Z}^2}|r_{X_m}(t,s)|<\infty$ and (7.24) follows the CLT for m-dependent RFs, see [5] Consider (7.25), where we can put $x=y=1$ w.l.g. We have $\lambda^{-(1+\gamma)}\mathrm{Var}(S^X_{\lambda,\gamma} - S^{X_m}_{\lambda,\gamma}) \le \sum_{(t,s)\in\mathbb{Z}^2}|\phi_m(t,s)|$, where $\phi_m(t,s) := \mathrm{Cov}\big(X(0,0)-X_m(0,0), X(t,s)-X_m(t,s)\big)$. From (8.26), (8.27) and (8.29) we conclude that

$$|\mathrm{Cov}(X(0,0),X(t,s))| + |\mathrm{Cov}(X(0,0),X_m(t,s))| + |\mathrm{Cov}(X_m(0,0),X_m(t,s))| \le C\rho(t,s)^{-(kp_1)\wedge(2q_1)}$$

as in (6.3), with $C>0$ independent of m. Therefore, $|\phi_m(t,s)| \le C\rho(t,s)^{-(kp_1)\wedge(2q_1)} =: \phi(t,s)$, where $\sum_{(t,s)\in\mathbb{Z}^2}\phi(t,s)<\infty$, see Proposition 5.1(i), also Corollary 6.1(ii). Thus, (7.25) follows by the dominated convergence theorem and the fact that $\lim_{m\to\infty}\phi_m(t,s)=0$ for any $(t,s)\in\mathbb{Z}^2$. Theorem 3.4 is proved. □

Proof of Theorem 3.5. (i) Split $X = X_k + X'_k$, where $X'_k := \sum_{j=k+1} c_j X_j/j!$, $X_j(t,s) := H_j(Y(t,s))$. Since all statements of Theorems 3.1-3.3 hold for RF $X_k = H_k(Y)$ and $\mathrm{Cov}(X_k(t_1,s_1), X'_k(t_2,s_2)) = 0$, $\forall (t_i,s_i) \in \mathbb{Z}^2, i = 1,2$, it suffices to show that

$$\mathrm{Var}(S^{X'_k}_{\lambda,\gamma}) \;=\; o(\lambda^{2H(\gamma)}), \qquad \lambda \to \infty \tag{7.26}$$

for $H(\gamma)$ defined in Theorems 3.1-3.3. By well-known properties of Hermite polynomials, $\mathrm{Var}(S^{X'_k}_{\lambda,\gamma}) = \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} c_j^2 \mathrm{Var}(S^{X_j}_{\lambda,\gamma})/(j!)^2$ and $\mathrm{Var}(S^{X_j}_{\lambda,\gamma}) = j! \sum_{(t_i,s_i)\in K_{[\lambda,\lambda^\gamma]}, i=1,2} r_Y^j(t_1-t_2, s_1-s_2) \le j! \Sigma_{k+1}(\lambda)$, where $\Sigma_{k+1}(\lambda) := \sum_{(t_i,s_i)\in K_{[\lambda,\lambda^\gamma]}, i=1,2} |r_Y(t_1-t_2, s_1-s_2)|^{k+1}$ for $j \ge k+1$ since $|r_Y(t,s)| \le 1$ according to Assumption $(\mathrm{A4})_k$. Hence, $\mathrm{Var}(S^{X'_k}_{\lambda,\gamma}) \le \big(\sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} c_j^2/j!\big)\Sigma_{k+1}(\lambda) \le \mathrm{E}G(Y(0,0))^2 \Sigma_{k+1}(\lambda)$, where $\Sigma_{k+1}(\lambda) = o(\lambda^{2H(\gamma)})$ follows by Proposition 5.1. This proves (7.26) and part (i).

(ii) For large $K \in \mathbb{N}, K > k$, split $X = X_K + X'_K$, where $X_K(t,s) = \sum_{j=k}^{K} c_j H_j(Y(t,s))/j!$ and $X'_K(t,s) := \sum_{j=K+1}^{\infty} c_j H_j(Y(t,s))/j!$. Then $\mathrm{Var}(S^{X'_K}_{\lambda,\gamma}) \le \big(\sum_{j=K+1}^{\infty} c_j^2/j!\big)\Sigma_{K+1}(\lambda)$ as in the proof of part (i), implying $\mathrm{Var}(S^{X'_K}_{\lambda,\gamma}) \le C\epsilon_K \lambda^{1+\lambda}$ where $\epsilon_K := \sum_{j=K+1}^{\infty} c_j^2/j!$ can be made arbitrary small by choosing K large enough. On the other hand, by Theorem 3.4 $\lambda^{-(1+\gamma)/2} S^{X_j}_{\lambda,\gamma}(x,y) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{fdd}} \sigma_{X_j} B_{1/2,1/2}(x,y)$ for any $j \ge k$ and the last result extends to finite sums of Hermite polynomials, viz., $\lambda^{-(1+\gamma)/2} S^{X_K}_{\lambda,\gamma}(x,y) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{fdd}} \sigma_{X_K} B_{1/2,1/2}(x,y)$, where $\sigma^2_{X_K} = \sum_{(t,s)\in\mathbb{Z}^2} \mathrm{Cov}(X_K(0,0), X_K(t,s)) \to \sigma^2_X$, $K \to \infty$. See e.g. ([14], proof of Thm.4.6.1). The remaining details are easy. Theorem 3.4 is proved. □

8 Proofs of Propositions 4.1, 5.1, 6.1 and Corollary 6.2

Proof of Proposition 4.1. The transition probabilities $q_u(v)$ in (4.7) can be explicitly written in terms of binomial probabilities $\mathrm{bin}(j,k;p) := \binom{k}{j} p^j (1-p)^{k-j}$, $k = 0,1,\cdots, j = 0,1,\cdots,k$, $0 \le p \le 1$:

$$q_u(v) \;=\; \sum_{j=0}^{u} \mathrm{bin}(u-j, u; \theta)\mathrm{bin}((v+j)/2, j; 1/2), \qquad u \in \mathbb{N},\ |v| \le u. \tag{8.1}$$

Similarly to ([18], proof of Prop.4.1) we shall use the following version of the Moivre-Laplace theorem (Feller [10], ch.7, §2, Thm.1): *There exists a constant C such when $j \to \infty$ and $k \to \infty$ vary in such a way that*

$$\frac{(j-kp)^3}{k^2} \;\to\; 0, \tag{8.2}$$

then

$$\left| \frac{\mathrm{bin}(j,k;p)}{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi kp(1-p)}} \exp\{-\frac{(j-kp)^2}{2kp(1-p)}\}} - 1 \right| \;<\; \frac{C}{k} + \frac{C|j-kp|^3}{k^2}. \tag{8.3}$$

Let us first explain the idea of the proof. Using (8.1) and replacing the binomial probabilities by Gaussian

densities according to (8.3) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
a(u,v) &\sim \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=0}^{u}\frac{1}{\Gamma(d)u^{1-d}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\theta(1-\theta)u}}\mathrm{e}^{-(j-(1-\theta)u)^2/2\theta(1-\theta)u}\,\frac{1}{\sqrt{j\pi/2}}\mathrm{e}^{-v^2/2j}\\
&= \frac{1}{\Gamma(d)\sqrt{2\pi}u^{3/2-d}}\sum_{j=0}^{v}u^{-1}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\theta(1-\theta)/u}}\mathrm{e}^{-u((j/u)-(1-\theta))^2/2\theta(1-\theta)}\frac{1}{\sqrt{j/u}}\mathrm{e}^{-(v^2/u)/2(j/u)}\\
&\sim \frac{1}{\Gamma(d)\sqrt{2\pi}u^{3/2-d}}\int_0^1\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\theta(1-\theta)/u}}\mathrm{e}^{-u(x-(1-\theta))^2/2\theta(1-\theta)}\frac{1}{\sqrt{x}}\mathrm{e}^{-(v^2/u)/2x}\mathrm{d}x\\
&\sim \frac{1}{\Gamma(d)\sqrt{2\pi}u^{3/2-d}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\theta}}\mathrm{e}^{-(v^2/u)/2(1-\theta)}\\
&= \rho(u,v)^{d-3/2}L_0(z)
\end{aligned}$$

with $L_0(z)$ defined in (4.8). Here, factor $1/2$ in front of the sum in the first line appears since $\mathrm{bin}((v+j)/2, j; 1/2) = 0$ whenever $v+j$ is odd, in other words, by using Gaussian approximation for all (even and odd) j we double the sum and therefore must divide it by 2. Note also that in the third line, the Gaussian kernel $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\theta(1-\theta)/u}}\mathrm{e}^{-u(x-(1-\theta))^2/2\theta(1-\theta)}$ acts as a δ-function at $x = 1-\theta$ when $u\to\infty$.

Let us turn to a rigorous proof of the above asymptotics. For $(u,v)\in\mathbb{Z}^2, (u,v)\neq(0,0)$, denote $\varrho := (u^2+v^4)^{1/2}, z := u/\varrho\in[-1,1]$, then $u = z\varrho, v^2 = \varrho\sqrt{1-z^2}$. It suffices to prove

$$\varrho^{3/2-d}a(u,v) - L_0(z) \;\to\; 0 \qquad \text{as } |u|+|v|\to\infty. \tag{8.4}$$

By definition (see (4.7), (4.8)), (8.4) holds for $u\le 0, z\le 0$ hence we can assume $u\ge 1, z>0$ in as follows. Moreover, for any $\epsilon>0$ there exists $K>0$ such that

$$\varrho^{3/2-d}a(u,v) < \epsilon \quad\text{and}\quad L_0(z)<\epsilon \quad (\forall\, 1\le u< v^{9/5},\ \varrho>K). \tag{8.5}$$

The second relation in (8.5) is immediate by $\lim_{z\to 0}L_0(z) = L_0(0) = 0$ and $z = u/\varrho\le \varrho^{9/10}/\varrho\to 0$ $(\varrho\to\infty)$. To prove the first relation we use Hoeffding's inequality [17]. Let $\mathrm{bin}(j,k;p)$ be the binomial distribution. Then for any $\tau>0$

$$\sum_{0\le j\le k:|j-kp|>\tau\sqrt{k}}\mathrm{bin}(j,k;p) \;\le\; 2\mathrm{e}^{-2\tau^2}. \tag{8.6}$$

(8.6) implies $\mathrm{bin}((v+j)/2, j; 1/2) \le 2\mathrm{e}^{-2v^2/j}\le 2\mathrm{e}^{-2v^2/u}$ for any $|v|\le u, 0\le j\le u$. Also note that $1\le u\le v^{9/5}$ implies $v^2\ge 2^{1/20}u\varrho^{1/10}$. Using these facts and (8.1) with $\sum_{j=0}^{u}\mathrm{bin}(u-j,u;\theta) = 1$ for any $1\le u< v^{8/5}$ we obtain

$$\varrho^{3/2-d}a(u,v) \;\le\; C\varrho^{3/2-d}q_u(v) \;\le\; C\varrho^{3/2-d}\mathrm{e}^{-2v^2/u} \;\le\; C\varrho^{3/2-d}\mathrm{e}^{-\varrho^{1/10}} \;\to\; 0, \quad \varrho\to\infty,$$

proving (8.5). Hence, it suffices to prove (8.4) for $u\to\infty, 0\le v\le u^{5/9}$. Below, we give the proof for v even, the proof for v odd being similar. Denote

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}^+(u,v) &:= \{0\le j\le u/2 : |2j-u(1-\theta)|< u^{3/5} \text{ and } |v|< j^{3/5}\},\\
\mathcal{D}^-(u,v) &:= \{0\le j\le u/2 : |2j-u(1-\theta)|\ge u^{3/5} \text{ or } |v|\ge j^{3/5}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Split $a(u,v) = \psi_u(-d)\sum_{0\le j\le u/2}\mathrm{bin}(u-2j,u;\theta)\mathrm{bin}(v/2+j,2j;1/2) = a^+(u,v)+a^-(u,v)$, where $a^\pm(u,v) := \psi_u(-d)\sum_{j\in\mathcal{D}^\pm(u,v)}\cdots$. It suffices to prove that

$$\varrho^{3/2-d}a^+(u,v) - L_0(z) \;\to\; 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \varrho^{3/2-d}a^-(u,v) \;\to\; 0 \tag{8.7}$$

as $u\to\infty, 0\le v\le u^{5/9}$. To show the first relation in (8.7), let $j_u^* := [u(1-\theta)/2]$ and

$$a^*(u,v) \;:=\; \mathrm{bin}(v/2+j_u^*,2j_u^*;1/2)\psi_u(-d)\sum_{j\in\mathcal{D}^+(u,v)}\mathrm{bin}(u-2j,u;\theta),$$

then

$$a^*(u,v)-a^+(u,v) \;=\; \psi_u(-d)\sum_{j\in\mathcal{D}^+(u,v)}\mathrm{bin}(u-2j,u;\theta)\big(\mathrm{bin}(v/2+j_u^*,2j_u^*;1/2)-\mathrm{bin}(v/2+j,2j;1/2)\big).$$

According to (8.3), for $j\in\mathcal{D}^+(u,v), j_u^*\in\mathcal{D}^+(u,v)$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{bin}(v/2+j,2j;1/2) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi j}}\mathrm{e}^{-v^2/4j}\big(1+O(j^{-1/5})\big) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi j}}\mathrm{e}^{-v^2/4j}\big(1+O(u^{-1/5})\big),\\ \mathrm{bin}(v/2+j_u^*,2j_u^*;1/2) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi j_u^*}}\mathrm{e}^{-v^2/4j_u^*}\big(1+O(u^{-1/5})\big).\end{aligned}$$

Using $c_-u<j<c_+u, j\in\mathcal{D}^+(u,v)$ for some $c_\pm>0$, and elementary inequalities we obtain that $|\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi j}}\mathrm{e}^{-v^2/4j} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi j_u^*}}\mathrm{e}^{-v^2/4j_u^*}| \le Cu^{-7/10}\mathrm{e}^{-cv^2/u}$ for some $C,c>0$ and hence the bound

$$\big|\mathrm{bin}(v/2+j_u^*,2j_u^*;1/2)-\mathrm{bin}(v/2+j,2j;1/2)\big| \;\le\; Cu^{-7/10}\mathrm{e}^{-cv^2/u}$$

for all $j\in\mathcal{D}^+(u,v)$ and all $u>0$ large enough. Therefore since $\sum_{j\in\mathcal{D}^+(u,v)}\mathrm{bin}(u-2j,u;\theta)\le 1$ we obtain

$$\varrho^{3/2-d}|a^*(u,v)-a^+(u,v)| \;\le\; C\varrho^{3/2-d}u^{-7/10+d-1}\mathrm{e}^{-cv^2/u} \;=\; \varrho^{-1/5}L^*(z) \;\le\; C\varrho^{-1/5},$$

where $L^*(z) := Cz^{d-17/10}\mathrm{e}^{-c\sqrt{(1/z)^2-1}}, z\in(0,1]$ is a bounded function. As a consequence, it suffices to prove the first relation in (8.7) with $a^+(u,v)$ replaced by $a^*(u,v)$. This in turn follows from relations $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi j_u^*}}\mathrm{e}^{-v^2/4j_u^*}\sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi u(1-\theta)/2}}\mathrm{e}^{-v^2/2u(1-\theta)}$, $\psi_u(-d)\sim\Gamma(d)^{-1}u^{d-1}$, and

$$\sum_{j\in\mathcal{D}^+(u,v)}\mathrm{bin}(u-2j,u;\theta) \;\to\; 1/2 \quad \text{as} \quad u\to\infty, \tag{8.8}$$

each of which hold uniformly in $0\le v\le u^{5/9}$. Let us check (8.8) for instance. Since $c_-u<j<c_+u, j\in\mathcal{D}^+(u,v)$ for some $c_\pm>0$, see above, so $u^{5/9}=o(j^{3/5})$ and (8.8) follows from

$$B'(u) \;\to\; 1/2 \quad \text{and} \quad B''(u)\to 0, \tag{8.9}$$

where $B'(u) := \sum_{j=0}^u \mathrm{bin}(u-j,u;\theta)\mathbf{1}(j \text{ is even})$, $B''(u) := \sum_{j=0}^u \mathrm{bin}(u-j,u;\theta)\mathbf{1}(|j-u(1-\theta)|\ge u^{3/5})$. Here, the first relation in (8.9) is obvious by well-known properties of binomial coefficients (??) while the second one follows from (8.6) according to which $B''(u)\le C\mathrm{e}^{-2u^{1/5}}\to 0$. This proves the first relation in (8.7).

The proof of the second relation in (8.7) uses Hoeffding's inequality in (8.6) in a similar way. We have $a^-(u,v) \le a_1^-(u,v)+a_2^-(u,v)$, where $a_1^-(u,v) := \psi_u(-d)\sum_{0\le j\le u:|j-u(1-\theta)|>u^{3/5}} \mathrm{bin}(u-j,u;\theta) \le Cu^{d-1}\mathrm{e}^{-2u^{1/5}}$ implying $\varrho^{3/2-d}J_1^-(u,v) \le Cu^{(10/9)(3/2-d)+(d-1)}\mathrm{e}^{-2u^{1/5}} \to 0\,(u\to\infty)$ uniformly in $|v|\le u^{5/9}$. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} a_2^-(u,v) &:= \psi_u(-d) \sum_{0\le j\le u:|j-u(1-\theta)|\le u^{3/5}, v\ge j^{3/5}} \mathrm{bin}(u-j,u;\theta)\mathrm{bin}((v+j)/2,j;1/2) \\ &\le Cu^{d-1} \sum_{c_1u\le j\le u, v\ge j^{3/5}} \mathrm{e}^{-2v^2/j} \;\le\; Cu^d\mathrm{e}^{-c_2u^{1/5}} \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$, implying $\varrho^{3/2-d}a_2^-(u,v) \le Cu^{(10/9)(3/2-d)+d}\mathrm{e}^{-c_2u^{1/5}} \to 0\,(u\to\infty)$ uniformly in $|v|\le u^{5/9}$ as above. This proves (8.7) and Proposition 4.1, too. □

Proof of Proposition 5.1. With the notation $\varrho := \rho(t,s)$ we have that $\{(t,s)\in\mathbb{R}^2, s\ge 0\} \ni (t,s) \mapsto (\varrho, t/\varrho) \in [0,\infty)\times[-1,1]$ is a 1-1 mapping. Particularly, if $\varpi = 1$ then $(\varrho, \arccos(t/\varrho))$ are the polar coordinates of $(t,s)\in\mathbb{R}^2, s\ge 0$. We use the inequality:

$$\rho(t_1+t_2, s_1+s_2) \le C_\varpi \sum_{i=1}^2 \rho(t_i,s_i), \quad (t_i,s_i)\in\mathbb{R}^2,\ i=1,2, \tag{8.10}$$

which follows from $\rho(t_1+t_2,s_1+s_2)^{1\wedge\varpi} \le \sum_{i=1}^2 \rho(t_i,s_i)^{1\wedge\varpi}$ with $C_\varpi := 1\vee 2^{1/\varpi-1}$.

(i) W.l.g., let $\delta = 1$. Then $\int_{B_1(0,0)}\rho(t,s)^{-h}\mathrm{d}t\mathrm{d}s \le 4\int_0^1 u^{\varpi-h}\mathrm{d}u\int_0^{1/u^\varpi}(1+v^{2/\varpi})^{-h/2}\mathrm{d}v$, where the inner integral $= O(1)$ if $h>\varpi$, $= O(u^{h-\varpi})$ if $h<\varpi$, $= O(|\log u|)$ if $h=\varpi$, as $u\to 0$. This proves (5.2) and (5.3) follows analogously.

(ii) After the change of variables: $u\to\varrho u$, $v\to\varrho^\varpi v$, $\varrho := \rho(t,s)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} (\rho^{-h_1}\star\rho^{-h_2})(t,s) &= \varrho^{1+\varpi-h_1-h_2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\rho(u,v)^{-h_1}\rho((t/\varrho)+u,(s/\varrho^\varpi)+v)^{-h_2}\mathrm{d}u\mathrm{d}v, \\ &= \varrho^{1+\varpi-h_1-h_2}(I_1+I_2+I_{12}), \end{aligned} \tag{8.11}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &:= \int_{B_\delta(0,0)}\rho(u,v)^{-h_1}\rho((t/\varrho)+u,(s/\varrho^\varpi)+v)^{-h_2}\mathrm{d}u\mathrm{d}v, \\ I_2 &:= \int_{B_\delta(-t/\varrho,-s/\varrho^\varpi)}\cdots\mathrm{d}u\mathrm{d}v, \qquad I_{12} := \int_{B_\delta^c(0,0)\cap B_\delta^c(-t/\varrho,-s/\varrho^\varpi)}\cdots\mathrm{d}u\mathrm{d}v \end{aligned}$$

with $\delta>0$ such that $B_\delta(0,0)\cap B_\delta(-t/\varrho,-s/\varrho^\varpi)=\emptyset$ for any $(t,s)\ne(0,0)$. The integrals $I_i\le C, i=1,2$ by (5.2) and $0<h_i<1+\varpi$, $i=1,2$. Next, by Hölder's inequality with $h := h_1+h_2$,

$$I_{12} \;\le\; \int_{B_\delta^c(0,0)}\rho(u,v)^{-h}\mathrm{d}u\mathrm{d}v \;\le\; C, \tag{8.12}$$

in view of (5.3) and $\int_{B_\delta^c(-t/\varrho,-s/\varrho^\varpi)}\rho((t/\varrho)+u,(s/\varrho^\varpi)+v)^{-h}\mathrm{d}u\mathrm{d}v = \int_{B_\delta^c(0,0)}\rho(u,v)^{-h}\mathrm{d}u\mathrm{d}v$. This proves (5.4).

Next, consider (5.5), or the case $0<h_2<1+\varpi<h_1$. By changing the variables as in (8.11), we get $(\rho_+^{-h_1}\star\rho^{-h_2})(t,s) \le \varrho^{1+\varpi-h_1-h_2}(I_1'+I_2+I_{12})$, where $I_2<C$, $I_{12}<C$ are the same as in (8.11), whereas

$$I_1' := \int_{B_\delta(0,0)}(\varrho^{-1}\vee\rho(u,v))^{-h_1}\rho((t/\varrho)+u,(s/\varrho^\varpi)+v)^{-h_2}\mathrm{d}u\mathrm{d}v.$$

Note that if given small enough $\delta > 0$, then (8.10) implies $\rho((t/\varrho)+u,(s/\varrho^{\varpi})+v)^{1\wedge\varpi} \geq 1-\rho(u,v)^{1\wedge\varpi} \geq 1/2$ for all $(u,v) \in B_\delta(0,0)$, and hence $I_1' \leq C\varrho^{h_1-1-\varpi}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\rho_+(u,v)^{-h_1}\mathrm{d}u\mathrm{d}v \leq C\varrho^{h_1-1-\varpi}$ according to (5.3). Since $\rho(t,s)^{1+\varpi-h_1-h_2} = o(\rho(t,s)^{-h_2})$ as $|t|+|s|\to\infty$, the proof of (5.5) is complete.

Finally, consider (5.6). We follow the proof of (5.5) and get $(\rho_+^{-h_1}\star\rho_+^{-h_2})(t,s) \leq \varrho^{1+\varpi-h_1-h_2}(I_1'+I_2'+I_{12})$ with the same $I_1' < C$, $I_{12} < C$, whereas

$$I_2' \;:=\; \int_{B_\delta(-t/\varrho,-s/\varrho^{\varpi})} \rho(u,v)^{-h_1}(\varrho^{-1}\vee\rho((t/\varrho)+u,(s/\varrho^{\varpi})+v))^{-h_2}\mathrm{d}u\mathrm{d}v.$$

For small enough $\delta > 0$, we have $\rho(u,v)^{1\wedge\varpi} \geq 1-\rho((t/\varrho)+u,(s/\varrho^{\varpi})+v)^{1\wedge\varpi} \geq 1/2$ for all $(u,v) \in B_\delta(-t/\varrho,-s/\varrho^{\varpi})$, and hence $I_2' \leq C\varrho^{h_2-1-\varpi}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\rho_+((t/\varrho)+u,(s/\varrho^{\varpi})+v)^{-h_2}\mathrm{d}u\mathrm{d}v \leq C\varrho^{h_2-1-\varpi}$ by (5.3). Using $\rho(t,s)^{1+\varpi-h_1-h_2} = o(\rho(t,s)^{-h_1\wedge h_2})$ as $|t|+|s|\to\infty$, we conclude (5.6). Extension of (5.4)-(5.6) to 'discrete' convolution $[\rho_+^{-h_1}\star\rho_+^{-h_2}](t,s)$ requires minor changes and we omit the details. This proves part (ii).

(iii) It suffices to show (5.7) for $(t,s) \neq (0,0), s \geq 0$, in which case $\rho_+(t,s) = \rho(t,s)$. We have $[a_1\star a_2](t,s) = \sum_{i,j=0}^1 [a_1^i\star a_2^j](t,s)$, where $a_i^0(t,s) := \rho_+(t,s)^{-h_i}L_i(t/\rho_+(t,s))$, $a_i^1(t,s) := a_i(t,s) - a_i^0(t,s) = o(\rho_+(t,s)^{-h_i})$, $i = 1,2$. Clearly, (5.7) follows from

$$\lim_{|t|+|s|\to\infty} \big|\rho(t,s)^{h_1+h_2-1-\varpi}[a_1^0\star a_2^0](t,s) - L_{12}(t/\rho(t,s))\big| \;=\; 0 \tag{8.13}$$

and

$$[a_1^i\star a_2^j](t,s) \;=\; o(\rho(t,s)^{1+\varpi-h_1-h_2}), \quad (i,j)\neq(0,0),\ i,j=0,1, \quad |t|+|s|\to\infty. \tag{8.14}$$

The proof of (8.14) mimics the proof of (8.13) and is omitted. To prove (8.13), write $[a_1^0\star a_2^0](t,s)$ as the integral: $[a_1^0\star a_2^0](t,s) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} a_1^0([u],[v])a_2^0([u]+t,[v]+s)\mathrm{d}u\mathrm{d}v$. $[a_1^0\star a_2^0](t,s) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} a_1^0([u],[v])a_2^0([u]+t,[v]+s)\mathrm{d}u\mathrm{d}v$. After the same change of variables $u\to\varrho u$, $v\to\varrho^{\varpi}v$, $\varrho := \rho(t,s)$ as in the proof of (ii) we obtain $[a_1^0\star a_2^0](t,s) = \varrho^{1+\varpi-h_1-h_2}L_\varrho(t/\varrho)$, where

$$L_\varrho(z) \;:=\; \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g_\varrho(u,v;z)\mathrm{d}u\mathrm{d}v, \quad z\in[-1,1] \tag{8.15}$$

and where

$$g_\varrho(u,v;z) \;:=\; a_{1\varrho}\big(\tilde{u},\tilde{v}\big)a_{2\varrho}\big(\tilde{u}+z,\tilde{v}+(1-z^2)^{\varpi/2}\big), \tag{8.16}$$

with $\tilde{u} := [\varrho u]/\varrho$, $\tilde{v} := [\varrho^{\varpi}v]/\varrho^{\varpi}$ and

$$a_{i\varrho}(u,v) \;:=\; \big(\varrho^{-1}\vee\rho(u,v)\big)^{-h_i}L_i\big(u/\big(\varrho^{-1}\vee\rho(u,v)\big)\big), \quad i=1,2, \tag{8.17}$$

since $s/\varrho^{\varpi} = (1-z^2)^{\varpi/2}$ for $z = t/\varrho \in [-1,1], s\geq 0$. Then with $a_{i\infty}(u,v), i=1,2$ defined by the statement of Prop. 5.1 (iii) we get that

$$g_\varrho(u,v;z) \;\to\; g_\infty(u,v;z) \;:=\; a_{1\infty}(u,v)a_{2\infty}(u+z,v+(1-z^2)^{\varpi/2}) \tag{8.18}$$

as $\varrho = \rho(t,s)\to\infty$ ($|t|+|s|\to\infty$) for any fixed $(u,v;z)\in\mathbb{R}^2\times[-1,1]$ such that $(u,v)\notin\{(0,0),(-z,-(1-z^2)^{\varpi/2})\}$ and $u/\rho(u,v)$, $(u+z)/\rho(u+z,v+(1-z^2)^{\varpi/2})$ being continuity points of L_1 and L_2 respectively. Let us prove that

$$L_\varrho(z) \;\to\; L_{12}(z) \quad \text{as } \varrho\to\infty \tag{8.19}$$

uniformly in $z \in [-1,1]$, which implies (8.13), viz., $|L_\varrho(t/\varrho) - L_{12}(t/\varrho)| \le \sup_{z\in[-1,1]} |L_\varrho(z) - L_{12}(z)| = o(1)$ as $\varrho \to \infty$. The uniform convergence in (8.19) follows if $\lim_{\varrho\to\infty} L_\varrho(z_\varrho) = L_{12}(z)$ holds for any $z \in [-1,1]$ and every sequence $\{z_\varrho\} \subset [-1,1]$ tending to z: $\lim_{\varrho\to\infty} z_\varrho = z$. Choose $\delta > 0$ and split the difference $L_\varrho(z_\varrho) - L_{12}(z) = I_1 + I_2 + I_{12}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &:= \int_{B_\delta(0,0)} (g_\varrho(u,v;z_\varrho) - g_\infty(u,v;z))\mathrm{d}u\mathrm{d}v, \\ I_2 &:= \int_{B_\delta(-z,-z')} \cdots \mathrm{d}u\mathrm{d}v, \qquad I_{12} := \int_{B_\delta^c(0,0)\cap B_\delta^c(-z,-z')} \cdots \mathrm{d}u\mathrm{d}v \end{aligned}$$

with the notation $z' := (1-z^2)^{\varpi/2}$. Note that $\rho(z,z') = 1$ and $\delta > 0$ is chosen small enough so that $B_\delta(0,0) \cap B_\delta(-z,-z') = \emptyset$. Let us first check that $|I_i|, i = 1,2$ can be made arbitrary small by taking sufficiently small δ. Towards this end, we need the bound

$$|a_{i\varrho}(\tilde u,\tilde v)| \;\le\; C\rho(u,v)^{-h_i}, \quad (u,v) \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad i = 1,2. \tag{8.20}$$

Indeed, by (8.10), $\rho(u,v) \le C_\varpi(\rho(\tilde u,\tilde v) + \rho(u-\tilde u, v-\tilde v))$, where $|u-\tilde u| \le \varrho^{-1}, |v-\tilde v| \le \varrho^{-\varpi}$ and hence $\rho(u-\tilde u, v-\tilde v) \le \sqrt{2}\varrho^{-1}$, with $C_\varpi > 0$ dependent only on $\varpi > 0$. Therefore, $\rho(u,v) \le \sqrt{2}C_\varpi(\rho(\tilde u,\tilde v) + \varrho^{-1}) \le 2\sqrt{2}C_\varpi(\rho(\tilde u,\tilde v) \vee \varrho^{-1})$ implying $\rho(\tilde u,\tilde v) \vee \varrho^{-1} \ge (2\sqrt{2}C_\varpi)^{-1}\rho(u,v)$, or (8.20) in view of the definition of $a_{i\varrho}$ in (8.17). Using (8.20) it follows that Using (8.20) it follows that

$$|g_\varrho(u,v;z_\varrho) - g_\infty(u,v;z)| \le C\rho(u,v)^{-h_1}\big(\rho(u+z_\varrho, v+z'_\varrho)^{-h_2} + \rho(u+z,v+z')^{-h_2}\big). \tag{8.21}$$

From (8.21) we obtain $|I_1| \le C\int_{B_\delta(0,0)} \rho(u,v)^{-h_1}\mathrm{d}u\mathrm{d}v \le C\delta^{1+\varpi-h_1} = o(1)$ and similarly, $|I_2| \le C\delta^{1+\varpi-h_2} = o(1)$. Hence it suffices to show that $I_{12} \to 0\,(z_\varrho \to z)$, viz., that for each $\delta > 0$

$$\int_{B_\delta^c(0,0)\cap B_\delta^c(-z,-z')} |g_\varrho(u,v;z_\varrho) - g_\infty(u,v;z)|\mathrm{d}u\mathrm{d}v \;\to\; 0 \quad \text{as } \varrho\to\infty. \tag{8.22}$$

From (8.10), $\rho(u+z_\varrho, v+z'_\varrho)^{1\wedge\varpi} \ge \rho(u+z,v+z')^{1\wedge\varpi} - \delta^{1\wedge\varpi}/2 \ge (1/2)\rho(u+z,v+z')^{1\wedge\varpi}$ for all $(u,v) \in B_\delta^c(-z,-z')$ and ϱ large enough that $\rho(z-z_\varrho, z'-z'_\varrho)^{1\wedge\varpi} \le \delta^{1\wedge\varpi}/2$ (in view of $z_\varrho \to z$). Hence and from (8.21) we obtain that the integrand in (8.22) is dominated on $B_\delta^c(0,0)\cap B_\delta^c(-z,-z')$ by an integrable function independent of ϱ, viz., $|g_\varrho(u,v;z_\varrho) - g_\infty(u,v;z)| \le C\rho(u,v)^{-h_1}\rho(u+z,v+z')^{-h_2}$. Since this integrand vanishes a.e. on $B_\delta^c(0,0)\cap B_\delta^c(-z,-z')$ as $\varrho\to\infty$, see (8.18), relation (8.22) follows by the dominated convergence theorem, proving (8.19). The continuity of L_{12} (5.8) follows similarly by the dominated convergence theorem.

It remains to prove the strict positivity of L_{12} in the case where $L_1(z) \equiv L_2(z) =: L(z) \ge 0$. Under assumption of piecewise continuity of L and $L \not\equiv 0$ a.e., we can find $0 < |z_0| < 1$ and $\delta > 0$ such that $L(z) > \delta$ for any $|z - z_0| < \delta$. We also have $|u/\rho(u,v) - (u+z)/\rho(u+z,v+z')| \le \rho(u,v)^{-1} + |1 - \rho(u+z,v+z')/\rho(u,v)| = O(\rho(u,v)^{-1\wedge\varpi})$ uniformly in $z \in [-1,1]$ for $\rho(u,v) \ge 1$. Indeed, this follows from $|1-(\rho(u+z,v+z')/\rho(u,v))^{1\wedge\varpi}| < \rho(u,v)^{-1\wedge\varpi}$ by (8.10), when combined with $|1-x| \le \varpi^{-1}(1\vee x)^{1-\varpi}|1-x^\varpi|$, $x > 0$ due to the mean value theorem if $0 < \varpi < 1$. Hence for $\rho(u,v) \ge K \ge 1$ large enough, we have $|u/\rho(u,v) - (u+z)/\rho(u+z,v+z')| < \delta/2$. Next, we can find the interior point (u_0,v_0) of $B_K^c(0,0)$ with $u_0/\rho(u_0,v_0) = z_0$. In view of continuity of $u/\rho(u,v)$, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $|z_0 - u/\rho(u,v)| < \delta/2$ holds

for all $(u,v) \in B_\varepsilon(u_0,v_0) \subset B_K^c(0,0)$. Consequently, $L(u/\rho(u,v))L((u+z)/\rho(u+z,v+z')) \geq \delta^2 > 0$ for any $z \in [-1,1]$ and all $(u,v) \in B_\varepsilon(u_0,v_0)$. By (8.10), we have $\rho(u+z,v+z') \leq 2C_\varpi \rho(u,v)$ for $\rho(u,v) \geq 1$ and hence $L_{12}(z) > \delta^2(2C_\varpi)^{-h_2} \int_{B_\varepsilon(u_0,v_0)} \rho(u,v)^{-h_1-h_2} \mathrm{d}u\mathrm{d}v > 0$, proving $L_{12}(z) > 0, z \in [-1,1]$ and part (iii).

(iv) Rewrite the l.h.s. of (5.9) as

$$B_\lambda(\gamma) \;=\; \int_{\widetilde{K}^2_{[\lambda,\lambda^\gamma]}} b([t_1]-[t_2],[s_1]-[s_2])\mathrm{d}t_1\mathrm{d}t_2\mathrm{d}s_1\mathrm{d}s_2, \tag{8.23}$$

where $\widetilde{K}_{[\lambda,\lambda^\gamma]} := \{(t,s) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : ([t],[s]) \in K_{[\lambda,\lambda^\gamma]}\}$.

Case (I): $\gamma = \varpi$. By changing the variables in (8.23) as $t_i \to \lambda t_i, s_i \to \lambda^\varpi s_i$, $i = 1,2$, we obtain $\lambda^{-2\mathcal{H}(\varpi)} B_\lambda(\varpi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \widetilde{b}_\lambda(t_1,t_2,s_1,s_2)\mathrm{d}t_1\mathrm{d}t_2\mathrm{d}s_1\mathrm{d}s_2$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{b}_\lambda(t_1,t_2,s_1,s_2) \;&:=\; b_\lambda(([\lambda t_1]-[\lambda t_2])/\lambda, ([\lambda^\varpi s_1]-[\lambda^\varpi s_2])/\lambda^\varpi) \\ &\quad \times \mathbf{1}(([\lambda t_i],[\lambda^\varpi s_i]) \in (0,\lambda] \times (0,\lambda^\varpi], i=1,2) \end{aligned} \tag{8.24}$$

with $b_\lambda(t,s) := (\lambda^{-1} \vee \rho(t,s))^{-h}(L(t/(\lambda^{-1} \vee \rho(t,s)) + o(1))$ as $\lambda \to \infty$. Then

$$\widetilde{b}_\lambda(t_1,t_2,s_1,s_2) \;\to\; b_\infty(t_1-t_2,s_1-s_2)\mathbf{1}((t_i,s_i) \in (0,1]^2, i=1,2), \qquad \lambda \to \infty$$

point-wise for any $(t_1,t_2,s_1,s_2) \in \mathbb{R}^4, (t_1,s_1) \neq (t_2,s_2)$ fixed. The dominating bound

$$\lambda^{-1} \vee \rho\big(([\lambda t_1]-[\lambda t_2])/\lambda, ([\lambda^\varpi s_1]-[\lambda^\varpi s_2])/\lambda^\varpi\big) \;\geq\; C\rho(t_1-t_2,s_1-s_2),$$

follows by the same arguments as (8.20). These facts and the dominated convergence theorem justify the limit $\lim_{\lambda\to\infty} \lambda^{-2\mathcal{H}(\varpi)} B_\lambda(\varpi) = \mathcal{C}(\varpi)$ since the integral $\mathcal{C}(\varpi) \leq C \int_{(-1,1]^2} \rho(t,s)^{-h}\mathrm{d}t\mathrm{d}s < \infty$ in (5.10) converges by Prop. 5.1 (i).

Case (II): $\gamma > \varpi, h < \varpi$. By changing the variables in (8.23) as $t_i \to \lambda t_i,\ s_i \to \lambda^\gamma s_i,\ i = 1,2$, we obtain $\lambda^{-2\mathcal{H}(\gamma)} B_\lambda(\gamma) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \widetilde{b}_\lambda(t_1,t_2,s_1,s_2)\mathrm{d}t_1\mathrm{d}t_2\mathrm{d}s_1\mathrm{d}s_2$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{b}_\lambda(t_1,t_2,s_1,s_2) \;&:=\; b_\lambda(([\lambda t_1]-[\lambda t_2])/\lambda^{\gamma/\varpi}, ([\lambda^\gamma s_1]-[\lambda^\gamma s_2])/\lambda^\gamma) \\ &\quad \times \mathbf{1}(([\lambda t_i],[\lambda^\gamma s_i]) \in (0,\lambda] \times (0,\lambda^\gamma], i=1,2) \end{aligned}$$

with $b_\lambda(t,s) := (\lambda^{-\gamma/\varpi} \vee \rho(t,s))^{-h}(L(t/(\lambda^{-\gamma/\varpi} \vee \rho(t,s))) + o(1))$ as $\lambda \to \infty$. Hence since $\gamma/\varpi > 1$ it follows that

$$\widetilde{b}_\lambda(t_1,t_2,s_1,s_2) \;\to\; b_\infty(0,s_1-s_2)\mathbf{1}((t_i,s_i) \in (0,1]^2, i=1,2), \qquad \lambda \to \infty$$

point-wise for any $(t_1,t_2,s_1,s_2) \in \mathbb{R}^4, s_1 \neq s_2$ fixed. Note $b_\infty(0,s) = L(0)|s|^{-h/\varpi}$ is integrable on $[-1,1]$ due to $h < \varpi$. The limit $\lim_{\lambda\to\infty} \lambda^{-2\mathcal{H}(\varpi)} B_\lambda(\varpi) = \mathcal{C}(\varpi)$ can be justified by the dominated convergence theorem using the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^{-\gamma/\varpi} \vee \rho\big(([\lambda t_1]-[\lambda t_2])/\lambda^{\gamma/\varpi}, ([\lambda^\gamma s_1]-[\lambda^\gamma s_2])/\lambda^\gamma\big) \;&\geq\; \lambda^{-\gamma/\varpi} \vee \rho(0, ([\lambda^\gamma s_1]-[\lambda^\gamma s_2])/\lambda^\gamma) \\ &\geq\; C\rho(0,s_1-s_2), \end{aligned}$$

which follows by the same arguments as (8.20).

Case (III): $\gamma > \varpi, h > \varpi$. By changing the variables in (8.23) as $t_i \to \lambda t_i, i = 1, 2, s_1 - s_2 \to \lambda^{\varpi} s_1, s_2 \to \lambda^{\gamma} s_2$, we obtain $\lambda^{-2\mathcal{H}(\gamma)} B_\lambda(\gamma) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \widetilde{b}_\lambda(t_1, t_2, s_1, s_2) \mathrm{d}t_1 \mathrm{d}t_2 \mathrm{d}s_1 \mathrm{d}s_2$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{b}_\lambda(t_1, t_2, s_1, s_2) &:= b_\lambda(([\lambda t_1] - [\lambda t_2])/\lambda, ([\lambda^{\varpi} s_1 + \lambda^{\gamma} s_2] - [\lambda^{\gamma} s_2])/\lambda^{\varpi}) \\ &\quad \times \mathbf{1}([\lambda t_i] \in (0, \lambda], i = 1, 2, [\lambda^{\varpi} s_1 + \lambda^{\gamma} s_2] \in (0, \lambda^{\gamma}], [\lambda^{\gamma} s_2] \in (0, \lambda^{\gamma}]) \end{aligned}$$

with $b_\lambda(t, s) := (\lambda^{-1} \vee \rho(t, s))^{-h} (L(t/(\lambda^{-1} \vee \rho(t, s)) + o(1))$ as $\lambda \to \infty$. Then

$$\widetilde{b}_\lambda(t_1, t_2, s, u) \;\; \to \;\; b_\infty(t_1 - t_2, s_1) \mathbf{1}((t_1, t_2, s_2) \in (0, 1]^3), \qquad \lambda \to \infty$$

for any $t_1 \neq t_2, s_1 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}, s_2 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ fixed since $\gamma > \varpi$ implies $\mathbf{1}(0 < [\lambda^{\varpi} s_1 + \lambda^{\gamma} s_2] \leq \lambda^{\gamma}]) \to \mathbf{1}(0 < s_2 < 1)$. The dominating bound

$$\lambda^{-1} \vee \rho\big(([\lambda t_1] - [\lambda t_2])/\lambda, ([\lambda^{\varpi} s_1 + \lambda^{\gamma} s_2] - [\lambda^{\gamma} s_2])/\lambda^{\varpi}\big) \;\geq\; C\rho(t_1 - t_2, s_1)$$

follows by the same arguments as (8.20), because $|([\lambda^{\varpi} s_1 + \lambda^{\gamma} s_2] - [\lambda^{\gamma} s_2])/\lambda^{\varpi} - s_1| \leq 2\lambda^{-\varpi}$. Then the dominated convergence in (5.9) is proved in view of $\mathcal{C}(\gamma) \leq C \int_{-1}^{1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho(t, s)^{-h} \mathrm{d}t \mathrm{d}s < \infty$.

Cases (IV) and (V) can be treated similarly to Cases (II) and (III) and we omit the details. Proposition 5.1 is proved. □

Proof of Proposition 6.1. (i) We first prove (6.2). According to (2.3)

$$Z(t, s) \;\; = \;\; \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{(D)_i} \sum_{(u,v)_i}^{\bullet} a(t - u_1, s - v_1)^{|D_1|} \cdots a(t - u_i, s - v_i)^{|D_i|} A_{|D_1|}(\varepsilon(u_1, v_1)) \cdots A_{|D_i|}(\varepsilon(u_i, v_i)) \quad (8.25)$$

where the sum $\sum_{(D)_i}$ is taken over all partitions of $\{1, 2, \cdots, k\}$ into i nonempty sets $D_1, \cdots, D_i$ having cardinality $|D_1| \geq 1, \cdots, |D_i| \geq 1$, $|D_1| + \cdots + |D_i| = k$. Thus, (8.25) is a decomposition of $Z(t, s) = A_k(Y(t, s)) - Y^{\bullet k}(t, s)$ into a sum of stationary 'off-diagonal' polynomial forms of order $i < k$ in i.i.d. r.v. $A_{|D_\ell|}(\varepsilon(u_\ell, v_\ell)), 1 \leq \ell \leq i$ with $\max(|D_1|, \cdots, |D_i|) \geq 2$. From (8.25) it follows that

$$|\mathrm{E} Z(0, 0) Z(t, s)| \;\; \leq \;\; C \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{(d)_i, (d')_i} \prod_{\ell=1}^{i} (|a|^{d_\ell} \star |a|^{d'_\ell})(t, s) \quad (8.26)$$

where the second sum is taken over all collections $(d)_i = (d_1, \cdots, d_i), (d')_i = (d'_1, \cdots, d'_i)$ of integers $d_\ell \geq 1, d'_\ell \geq 1$ with $\sum_{\ell=1}^{i} d_\ell = \sum_{\ell=1}^{i} d'_\ell = k$ and satisfying $\max_{1 \leq \ell \leq i} d_\ell \geq 2, \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq i} d'_\ell \geq 2$. See [14], proof of Thm 14.2.1. Then $a(t, s)^{d_\ell} \leq C\rho(t, s)^{-\beta_\ell}, a(t, s)^{d'_\ell} \leq C\rho(t, s)^{-\beta'_\ell}$ where $\beta_\ell := d_\ell q_1, \beta'_\ell := d'_\ell q_1$. By Proposition 5.1 (ii)

$$|\mathrm{E} Z(0, 0) Z(t, s)| \;\; \leq \;\; C \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{(d)_i, (d')_i} \prod_{\ell=1}^{i} \rho(t, s)^{-w_\ell}, \quad (8.27)$$

where

$$w_\ell \;:=\; \begin{cases} 2q_1 - 1 - \gamma_0 = p_1, & \text{if } d_\ell = d'_\ell = 1, \\ q_1, & \text{if } d_\ell \geq 2,\ d'_\ell = 1 \text{ or } d_\ell = 1,\ d'_\ell \geq 2, \\ 2q_1, & \text{if } d_\ell \geq 2,\ d'_\ell \geq 2. \end{cases} \quad (8.28)$$

Since $2q_1 - 1 - \gamma_0 < q_1 < 2q_1$, we have that, for $\max_{1\le\ell\le i} d_\ell \ge 2, \max_{1\le\ell\le i} d'_\ell \ge 2$, the exponents w_ℓ in (8.28) satisfy $\sum_{\ell=1}^{i} w_\ell \ge 2q_1$, implying (6.2). Since RFs $\{Y^{\bullet k}(t,s)\}$ and $\{Z(t,s)\}$ are uncorrelated: $\mathrm{Cov}(Y^{\bullet k}(t,s), Z(u,v)) = 0$ for any $(t,s),(u,v) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, relation (6.1) follows from (6.2) and

$$\mathrm{Cov}(Y^{\bullet k}(t,s), Y^{\bullet k}(0,0)) \;=\; r_Y(t,s)^k(1+o(1)), \qquad |t|+|s| \to \infty. \tag{8.29}$$

To show (8.29), note that the difference $|r_Y(t,s)^k - \mathrm{Cov}(Y^{\bullet k}(t,s), Y^{\bullet k}(0,0))| = \big|(a\star a)^k(t,s) - \sum^{\bullet}_{(u,v)_k} a(t+u_1, s+v_1)a(u_1,v_1)\cdots a(t+u_k, s+v_k)a(u_k,v_k)\big|$ satisfies the same bound as in (8.27) and therefore this difference is $O(\rho(t,s)^{-2q_1}) = o(r_Y(t,s)^k)$ according to (6.2). This proves (8.29) and part (i). Part (ii) follows similarly using (6.2) and $|\mathrm{Cov}(Y^{\bullet k}(t,s), Y^{\bullet k}(0,0))| \le (|a|\star|a|(t,s))^k \le C\rho_+(t,s)^{-kp_1}$. Proposition 6.1 is proved. □

Proof of Corollary 6.2. Relation (6.5) follows from (6.2) and Proposition 5.1 (i) since the l.h.s. of (6.5) does not exceed $\sum_{(t_1,s_1),(t_2,s_2)\in K_{[\lambda,\lambda^\gamma]}} |r_Z(t_1-t_2, s_1-s_2)| \le \lambda^{1+\gamma} \sum_{(t,s)\in\mathbb{Z}^2} |r_Z(t,s)| \le C\lambda^{1+\gamma} \sum_{(t,s)\in\mathbb{Z}^2} \rho_+(t,s)^{-2q_1}$ and the last sum converges by Proposition 5.1 (i) due to $2q_1 > 1+\gamma_0$.
Relations (6.4) follow from (6.5), the orthogonality of $\{Y^{\bullet k}(t,s)\}$ and $\{Z(t,s)\}$ and

$$\mathrm{Var}\big(\sum\nolimits_{(t,s)\in K_{[\lambda,\lambda^\gamma]}} Y^{\bullet k}(t,s)\big) \;\sim\; c(\gamma)\lambda^{2H(\gamma)}. \tag{8.30}$$

In turn, (8.30) follows from

$$\mathcal{V}_{\lambda,\gamma} \;:=\; \sum_{(t_1,s_1),(t_2,s_2)\in K_{[\lambda,\lambda^\gamma]}} r_Y^k(t_1-t_2, s_1-s_2) \;\sim\; c(\gamma)^2\lambda^{2H(\gamma)} \tag{8.31}$$

and the fact that the difference $\big|\mathrm{Var}\big(\sum_{(t,s)\in K_{[\lambda,\lambda^\gamma]}} Y^{\bullet k}(t,s)\big) - \sum_{(t_1,s_1),(t_2,s_2)\in K_{[\lambda,\lambda^\gamma]}} r_Y^k(t_1-t_2, s_1-s_2)\big|$ can be estimated as in (8.26)-(8.27) and therefore this difference is $O(\lambda^{1+\gamma}) = o(\lambda^{2H(\gamma)}$ as shown in (6.5).

References

[1] Anh, V.V., Leonenko, N.N. and Ruiz-Medina, M.D. (2013) Macroscaling limit theorems for filtered spatiotemporal random fields. Stochastic Anal. Appl. 31, 460–508.

[2] Avram, F. and Taqqu, M.S. (1987) Noncentral limit theorems and Appell polynomials. Ann. Probab. 15, 767–775.

[3] Bai, S. and Taqqu, M.S. (2014) Generalized Hermite processes, discrete chaos and limit theorems. Stochastic Process. Appl. 124, 1710–1739.

[4] Biermé, H., Meerschaert, M.M. and Scheffler, H.P. (2007) Operator scaling stable random fields. Stoch. Process. Appl. 117, 312-332.

[5] Bolthausen, E. (1982) On the central limit theorem for stationary mixing random fields. Ann. Probab. 10, 1047–1050.

[6] Breuer, P. and Major, P. (1983) Central limit theorems for non-linear functionals of Gaussian fields. J. Multiv. Anal. 13, 425-441.

[7] Boissy, Y., Bhattacharyya, B.B., Li, X. and Richardson, G.D. (2005) Parameter estimates for fractional autoregressive spatial processes. Ann. Statist. 33, 2533–2567.

[8] Dobrushin, R.L. (1979) Gaussian and their subordinated self-similar random generalized fields. Ann. Probab. 7, 1–28.

[9] Dobrushin, R.L. and Major, P. (1979) Non-central limit theorems for non-linear functionals of Gaussian fields. Z. Wahrsch. verw. Geb. 50, 27–52.

[10] Feller, W. (1966) *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications*, vol. 2. Wiley, New York.

[11] Gaigalas, R. and Kaj, I. (2003) Convergence of scaled renewal processes and a packet arrival model. Bernoulli 9, 671–703.

[12] Guo, H., Lim, C. and Meerschaert, M. (2009) Local Whittle estimator for anisotropic random fields. J. Multiv. Anal. 100, 993–1028.

[13] Giraitis, L. and Surgailis, D. (1985) CLT and other limit theorems for functionals of Gaussian processes. Z. Wahrsch. verw. Geb. 70, 191–212.

[14] Giraitis, L., Koul, H.L. and Surgailis, D. (2012) *Large Sample Inference for Long Memory Processes.* Imperial College Press, London.

[15] Hankey, A. and Stanley, H.E. (1972) Systematic application of generalized homogeneous functions to static scaling, dynamic scaling, and universality. Phys. Review B 6, 3515–3542.

[16] Ho, H.-C. and Hsing, T. (1997) Limit theorems for functionals of moving averages. Ann. Probab. 25, 1636–1669.

[17] Hoeffding, W. (1963) Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. 58, 13–30.

[18] Koul, H.L., Mimoto, N. and Surgailis, D. (2016) Goodness-of-fit tests for marginal distribution of linear random fields with long memory. Metrika 79, 165–193.

[19] Lavancier, F. (2007) Invariance principles for non-isotropic long memory random fields. Statist. Inference Stoch. Process. 10, 255–282.

[20] Lavancier, F., Leipus, R. and Surgailis, D. (2014) Anisotropic long-range dependence and aggregation of space-time models. Preprint.

[21] Leonenko, N.N. (1999) *Random Fields with Singular Spectrum.* Kluwer, Dordrecht.

[22] Mikosch, T., Resnick, S., Rootzén, H. and Stegeman, A. (2002) Is network traffic approximated by stable Lévy motion or fractional Brownian motion? Ann. Appl. Probab. 12, 23–68.

[23] Neveu, J. (1964) *Bases mathématiques du calcul de probabilités*, Mason, Paris.

[24] Nualart, D. and Peccati, G. (2005) Central limit theorems for sequences of multiple stochastic integrals. Ann. Probab. 33, 177–193.

[25] Orey, S. (1958) A central limit theorem for m-dependent random variables. Duke Math. J. 25, 543–546.

[26] Pilipauskaitė, V. and Surgailis, D. (2014) Joint temporal and contemporaneous aggregation of random-coefficient AR(1) processes. Stochastic Process. Appl. 124, 1011–1035.

[27] Pilipauskaitė, V. and Surgailis, D. (2015) Joint aggregation of random-coefficient AR(1) processes with common innovations. Statist. Probab. Letters 101, 73–82.

[28] Pilipauskaitė, V. and Surgailis, D. (2016) Anisotropic scaling of random grain model with application to network traffic. J. Appl. Probab. (in press). Available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1510.07423.

[29] Pratt, J.W. (1960) On interchanging limits and integrals. Ann. Math. Statist. 31, 74–77.

[30] Puplinskaitė, D. and Surgailis, D. (2016) Aggregation of autoregressive random fields and anisotropic long-range dependence. Bernoulli (in press), DOI 10.3150/15-BEJ733. Available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1303.2209v3.

[31] Puplinskaitė, D. and Surgailis, D. (2015) Scaling transition for long-range dependent Gaussian random fields. Stoch. Process. Appl. 125, 2256–2271.

[32] Skorokhod, A.V. (1956) Limit theorems for stochastic processes. Th. Probab. Appl. 1, 261–290.

[33] Surgailis, D. (1982) Zones of attraction of self-similar multiple integrals. Lithuanian Math. J. 22, 185–201.

[34] Taqqu, M.S. (1979) Convergence of integrated processes of arbitrary Hermite rank. Z. Wahrsch. verw. Geb. 50, 53–83. Fractional Brownian motion and long-range dependence.